

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

MEETING OF THE
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

CALTRANS DISTRICT OFFICE
MARTIN KING, JR. LIBRARY
ROOM 255/257
150 EAST SAN FERNANDO STREET
SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95112

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2009
9:03 A.M.

A P P E A R A N C E S

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Hamid Bahadori, Chairperson

John Fisher, Vice Chairperson

Jeff Knowles

Deborah Wong

Robert Maynard

Wayne Henley

John Presleigh, Alternate, on behalf of Mr. Mansourian

Jacob Babico

CALTRANS PERSONNEL

Devinder Singh, Committee Secretary

Robert Copp

Roberta McLaughlin

Gurinderpal "Johnny" Bhullar

Don Howe

ALSO PRESENT

James Helmer
City of San Jose

Hans F. Larsen
Department of Transportation
City of San Jose

Bob Shanteau
California Association of Bicycling Organizations

David Roseman
Department of Public Works
City of Long Beach

ALSO PRESENT

Lieutenant Donald Discher
Department of Public Safety
City of Sunnyvale

Peter Caruso
Caltrans - Department of Transportation
County of Orange

Steve Pyburn
Federal Highway Administration

Don Howe
Caltrans - Department of Transportation

Laura Wells, Deputy Director
Department of Transportation

Mark Christoffels
Department of Public Works
City of Long Beach

Rock Miller
KOA Corporation

Manuel Cota
City of San Jose

Ryan Chapman
City of San Luis Obispo

Larry Patterson
League of Cities

Maurice Palumbo
Golden Gate Bridge

Doris Quai Hoi
City of Campbell

Matthew Jue
City of Campbell

Jessy Pu
Town of Los Gatos

Zahir Guilzudah
City of San Jose

ALSO PRESENT

Sam Koosha
City of San Jose

Hossein Rahnema

Jonathan Kim
City of San Jose

Jack Rupani
City of San Jose

Matilde Miranda
City of San Jose

Art Lake
Lake Traffic Solutions

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Organization Items</u>	
1. Introduction/Announcements	1
2. Approval of Minutes	8
3. Membership	9
4. Public Comments	9
<u>Agenda Items</u>	
5. Public Hearing	14
07-17 Proposal for C17A ROAD WORK Plaque and Amendment to CA MUTCD Section 6F.104	14
09-17 California MUTCD Revision to Include National MUTCD 2003 Revision No. 2 Maintaining Traffic Sign Retroreflectivity and Other Miscellaneous Policies Recommended by CTCDC	69
09-19 Proposal to Amend CA MUTCD Section 1A.10	87
09-20 Proposed Amendment to CA MUTCD Introduction	89
09-23 Proposal to add NO PARKING Signs During School Days to CA MUTCD Section 2B.39	95
6. Request for Experimentation	126
09-21 Request for Permission to Experiment with Separated/Protected Bikeway on the Left Side with Two One-Way Streets (Rte 9-112E) Part One	126
Afternoon Session	187
6. Request for Experimentation - continued	187
09-21 Request for Permission to Experiment with Separated/Protected Bikeway on the Left Side with Two One-Way Streets (Rte 9-112E) Part Two	187

I N D E XPage

6. Request for Experimentation - continued	
09-21 Request for Permission to Experiment with Separated/Protected Bikeway on the Left Side with Two One-Way Streets (Rte 9-112E) Part Three	227
09-22 Request to Experiment with a Collision Countermeasure System for Unsignalized Inter- sections by the County of San Luis Obispo	257
7. Discussion Items	275
8. Information Items	275
9. Recent Actions Taken by Caltrans on the Committee's Recommendations	--
10. Tabled Items	281
11. Off-Agenda Item	281
Wildfire Signs	281
12. Next Meeting, Thursday, January 21, 2010	286
13. Adjournment	288
Certificate of Reporter	289

1 of logistic and housekeeping notes and stuff like that that
2 we're going to go through.

3 Let's start with Jeff.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Jeff Knowles with the
5 City of Vacaville, and representing the League of California
6 Cities Northern Section.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Deborah Wong representing
8 AAA of Northern California.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Robert Maynard
10 representing California Highway Patrol.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Wayne Henley
12 representing Caltrans.

13 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Devinder Singh; I'm
14 the Secretary for the Committee. Caltrans, Traffic
15 Division.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Good morning;
17 I'm John Fisher with the City of Los Angeles DOT, and I
18 represent the League of California Cities Southern Branch.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: John Presleigh with
20 the County of Santa Cruz. Northern California Counties.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Actually before
22 we go to the audience let me do a couple of --

23 (Laughter.)

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: My name is Jacob Babico;
25 good morning to all of you. I work for the County of San

1 Bernardino; I represent CSAC, Southern California.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: The only reason I
3 skipped Jacob is because everybody knows Jacob. So he
4 doesn't need an introduction.

5 Before we go with that, we have a couple -- first,
6 one of our Alternates is here. As he introduced himself, to
7 my left, Mr. Presleigh, who is substituting today. We are
8 very happy to have you here.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: Thank you.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Mansourian
11 had another engagement. One of our Alternates is also in
12 the audience, Mr. Patterson, Larry Patterson. He's Director
13 of Public Works for the City of San Mateo. And he is the
14 Alternate to Jeff. Glad to have you here, sir.

15 MR. PATTERSON: Thank you.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Before we go with
17 the audience introduction, let me first thank the City of
18 San Jose for providing the facility here to us. Gorgeous
19 new building, probably new. And we have Mr. Jim Helmer
20 Director of Public Transportation, City. Do you want to say
21 a few words?

22 By the way, I just was informed that he's planning
23 to retire next month. Congratulations.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Right. I brought around
25 my résumé.

1 (Laughter.)

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: All kidding aside, I
3 wanted to really thank the Commission for selecting today's
4 meeting site in San Jose. I know that many of you have been
5 here and watched us change over the last few decades.

6 And for those of you who have not visited San Jose
7 recently, we welcome you.

8 We have some San Jose Staff here today. You'll
9 see who they are when they're introduced. Just on behalf of
10 the City of San Jose, I want to say that we take your work
11 seriously. We follow the minutes, the agendas. As you
12 know, we've had membership on the Committee in the past.

13 I will be checking out as the San Jose Director of
14 Transportation in just a couple of weeks. And that was a
15 decision that was difficult for me because what better job
16 could one ask for that touches so many lives, really, in
17 terms of what we all do. We're not -- but we certainly play
18 a very important role in the quality of lives of people
19 going to work, going to school, going to the library, going
20 home.

21 So we acknowledge your efforts. There's many good
22 topics that we're going to be talking on today. We have a
23 strong interest in them here, as well.

24 I wanted to introduce -- just one second, if I can
25 introduce my acting replacement, Hans Larsen. Hans is a

1 long-time City of San Jose employee, nearly 25 years. He's
2 recognized statewide and nationally for a very proactive
3 transportation policy and management activities.

4 He's worked very closely on the high-speed rail
5 project, as well as the BART-to-San Jose project, plus rapid
6 transit projects, and many many multiple regional highway
7 improvement projects. Hans, can you say a couple words.

8 MR. LARSEN: Yeah, very brief. Thank you, Jim.
9 It's a real pleasure to step into the role, some very big
10 shoes for me to fill. Jim's been a great leader in
11 California and in the United States in the area of
12 transportation. So I look forward to taking on that.

13 So my background is primarily been in the area of
14 transportation planning projects and policy. Very much
15 appreciate the work that you do to keep California safe from
16 a transportation perspective and put together a great
17 system.

18 Just a couple of things from San Jose's
19 perspective. We are very much leaders in the area of safety
20 and sustainability, very proud of our safety record. And in
21 the area of sustainability we're making some bold steps,
22 particularly in terms of mode shift and bicycle travel.

23 And we hope to bring forward to this group some
24 innovations that we plan to do to try to move the number of
25 people that ride bicycles from the current 1 percent up to 5

1 percent; and pilot some of the things we're seeing in places
2 like Oregon, Washington, Chicago, New York City and bring
3 some of those innovations here to California.

4 So, again, enjoy your day. Welcome to San Jose.
5 And thanks for all the great work that you do.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you.
7 Thanks, Jim. Good luck with the new assignment.

8 Okay, with that, we can go to the audience. And
9 with this gentleman, if you'd introduce yourself, your
10 affiliation and what item, if any, you are here with.

11 MR. CHAPMAN: I'm Ryan Chapman with San Luis
12 Obispo County. And I'm here for item 9-22.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

14 MR. PYBURN: I'm Steve Pyburn with the Federal
15 Highway Administration in Sacramento. And I'm here to
16 observe.

17 DR. SHANTEAU: I'm Bob Shanteau with California
18 Association of Bicycling Organizations. I'm also a traffic
19 engineer, and I'm here for item 09-21.

20 MS. WELLS: Laura Wells, City of San Jose, Deputy
21 Director for Transportation -- Operations --

22 MR. GUILZUDAH: Zahir Guilzudah, San Jose. I'm
23 here for (inaudible).

24 MR. KIM: Jonathan Kim, City of San Jose. And I'm
25 here to observe.

1 MR. COPP: Robert Copp, Caltrans. Division of
2 Traffic Operations.

3 MR. PATTERSON: Larry Patterson. I've been
4 introduced, thank you. And, folks, again, I'll be here for
5 about an hour or two today.

6 MR. ROSEMAN: David Roseman, City Traffic Engineer
7 for the City of Long Beach. I'm here for 9- --

8 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: Mark Christoffels, Deputy
9 Director of Public Works and City Engineer for the City of
10 Long Beach. And I'm here for item 9-21.

11 MR. MILLER: Rock Miller with KOA Corporation,
12 Northern California. I'm here assisting the City of Long
13 Beach on 9-21.

14 MR. CARUSO: Peter Caruso, Orange County Traffic
15 Operations. I'm here for 8-13, 8-14 --

16 MR. HOWE: I'm Don Howe; with the Staff for
17 Caltrans, item 9-19.

18 MR. PALUMBO: Good morning; my name's Maurice
19 Palumbo. I work with the Golden Gate Bridge -- San
20 Francisco. And I'm here for (inaudible).

21 MS. QUAI HOI: Doris Quai Hoi with the City of
22 Campbell.

23 MR. JUE: Matthew Jue, City of Campbell.

24 MR. COTA: Manuel Cota, City of San Jose. I'm
25 here to observe 9-21.

1 LT. DISCHER: Donald Discher, Sunnyvale Police
2 Department, Supervisor of the Traffic Enforcement Unit. To
3 observe.

4 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Roberta McLaughlin, Caltrans
5 Headquarters on status report and speed limit issues.

6 MR. BHULLAR: The last, but not the least, Johnny
7 Bhullar, -- California League of City, this Committee
8 (inaudible). I'm going to share that on one of the items,
9 today.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you. So
11 you know what happens if the recommendations of the
12 Committee are not implemented in a timely manner, who is
13 responsible.

14 Richard, did you get all these names? You can get
15 it from there.

16 Okay, done with the introductions. Approval of
17 minutes. Colleague, have you had a chance to look at the
18 minutes of our meeting of May 14th? If so, any corrections,
19 additions, modifications? If not, any motion to approve?

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Move approval.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: A motion.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Second.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There is a
24 second.

25 All those in favor say aye.

1 (Ayes.)

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Anybody opposing?

3 Seeing none, the minutes of May 14th are approved.

4 Membership. Colleague, any comments about items
5 that are not on the agenda or any information you would like
6 to share? No? Okay.

7 We'll go to public comments.

8 DR. SHANTEAU: Mr. Bahadori? I had to get a copy
9 of the agenda so I could make a comment during public
10 comments. Is that where we are?

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I was about to
12 get to the public comments.

13 DR. SHANTEAU: Okay.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You're at a good
15 place, just stay there. We're done with no comments from
16 the membership.

17 We'll go to public comments at this time. Members
18 of the public may comment on any item not appearing on the
19 agenda. Matters presented under this item cannot be
20 discussed or acted upon by the Committee at this time.

21 Mr. Shanteau.

22 DR. SHANTEAU: Yes. California Association of --

23 THE REPORTER: Sir, could you state your name,
24 please.

25 DR. SHANTEAU: My name is Bob Shanteau, California

1 Association of Bicycling Organizations. We're concerned
2 about the -- on page 5, under items under experimentation.
3 The --

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: If it's an item,
5 if it's an item that's on the agenda you can discuss it when
6 we get to the item.

7 DR. SHANTEAU: This is not -- items under
8 experimentation --

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Oh, it's just
10 information, go ahead.

11 DR. SHANTEAU: And that's the point is that you
12 don't discuss items under experimentation. And there's
13 nothing in your agenda regarding these items under
14 experimentation.

15 I would like to inform you, for one, that item 08-
16 21, proposal to experiment with -- I'm sorry, 8-21, yes, 8-
17 21, which for the bikes and lane sign.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Um-hum.

19 DR. SHANTEAU: There is no status report on that.
20 What has happened is that in your, I believe in your May
21 meeting last year in San Francisco, I was there. You
22 approved that on condition that it go to the California
23 Bicycle Advisory Committee for recommendation; and to
24 Federal Highway Administration for approval. It did not.
25 I'm sorry, it did go to California Bicycle Advisory

1 Committee. They recommended that there be a human factor
2 study done. Caltrans was there; they understood that.

3 But then the next thing we hear, there was never
4 any application to Federal Highway Administration for
5 approval of their request to experiment.

6 The next thing we hear is last October they put up
7 signs, Caltrans District 5 put up the signs on Mission
8 Street Highway State Road 1, the bikes and lanes signs. And
9 they are still there today.

10 So we are very concerned on two matters. One is,
11 is the California Traffic Control Devices Committee going to
12 do anything about the fact that Caltrans did not follow
13 through on the direction from the CTCDC.

14 And two, that there's no status report on most
15 or -- I suppose most of these items. I've checked with Mr.
16 Singh and he said there were status reports on a couple of
17 these items under experimentation. But for most of these
18 items there are no status reports.

19 And that information was not provided to the
20 California Traffic Control Devices Committee. We're very
21 very concerned about that, because under, in the manual on
22 uniform traffic control devices, if you'll pull up --
23 whoever has control of the computer. Who does? Devinder.
24 Devinder, could you bring up section 1A10 of the --

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I don't have access.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Shanteau,
2 just go ahead with your comments. No need to bring it up. I
3 got the gist of what you are saying and I can --

4 DR. SHANTEAU: Under termination of experiments in
5 section 1A10 of the California Manual on Uniform Traffic
6 Control Devices, in blue text, it says that status reports
7 are due 45 days before meetings. I don't know which
8 meetings they mean. I presume they meant CTCDC meetings.
9 What other meetings could they mean -- could that mean? And
10 yet, status reports are not being provided.

11 Another paragraph in that same section says that
12 if there are no status reports, that is grounds for
13 termination of the experiment. As far as I can tell that
14 sentence has never been invoked.

15 I would suggest to the California Traffic Control
16 Devices that it invoke that sentence for the bikes and lanes
17 signs, item 08-21, because Caltrans did not follow the
18 motion that was made and passed last May in San Francisco at
19 the CTCDC meeting.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

21 DR. SHANTEAU: Those are my comments.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you for
23 your comments. It's a timely comment because Mr. Singh also
24 has been trying to update, get the status on the items under
25 experimentation.

1 At this time, Mr. Henley, do you like to share
2 something with the members about 8-21 or --

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yes, I can. You know,
4 as many of you may have heard, you know, we did actually
5 work with the University of California at Santa Cruz to do a
6 human factor study.

7 Now, that human factor study -- the FA -- said it
8 was inadequate. And the district did, indeed, go ahead and
9 install those signs because they're under pressure by the
10 City of Santa Cruz.

11 Now, in the intervening -- what has it been now,
12 ten months or whatever -- they've had a lot of positive
13 comments, no negative comments, within the city. And no
14 accidents to report.

15 And it's going along positively at this point.
16 And they are prepared, at the next meeting, to come forward
17 with a little more detailed information about --

18 DR. SHANTEAU: They who?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: They meaning the
20 district that installed the signs.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. In
22 general, the point that the speaker brought up, Mr. Singh is
23 working on those and we are trying to bring some closure,
24 and keep a regular status update for the Committee members
25 on the items under experimentation.

1 Colleagues, I think you all have received the
2 latest, you all have a copy of this? So, and on the 8-21,
3 we will be waiting to hear a status report in the future
4 meetings.

5 Any other members of the public have any comments?

6 Seeing none, we close the public comments and come to our
7 agenda items. Mr. Singh, shall we go in the order that we
8 have.

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. First we
11 go to public hearing, item 7-17, actually 07-17. Proposal
12 for C-17A (CA) ROAD WORK plaque and amendment to CA MUTCD
13 Section 6F.104. Mr. Henley, what is this?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay, well, as you can
15 see, this one's been kicking around since 07. You got the
16 07-17, means it's been here since 2007. And I think we've
17 finally come to resolution on the issues and on the signs.
18 And Johnny Bhullar here is going to fill us in on the
19 details. And hopefully this will be the last time we hear
20 about it for awhile.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Bhullar.

22 MR. BHULLAR: Good morning, everyone. I'm Johnny
23 Bhullar with Caltrans. And as part of the agenda I was
24 starting on page 7, that's where this item begins.

25 And as Wayne pointed out it started back in 2007.

1 And I do have a summary of the actions and what the
2 Committee has done, and what we have done in response to
3 that. So I'm going to briefly summarize that.

4 Starting on page 7, basically we had introduced
5 this item back in June 7th of 2007, at that meeting. And
6 there were those bulleted comments that were made to us
7 regarding the first proposal.

8 And subsequently, based upon those bulleted
9 comments, we had a revised proposal. And the revised
10 proposal was shared, I believe, at the September 17th and
11 18th 2008 meeting that we had down in Pasadena.

12 And at that meeting then there were more comments
13 made. And based upon those comments -- those are
14 highlighted on page 8 of 55 on your agenda. And they are
15 highlighted in the yellow text.

16 And the issues that were raised, so I'm just going
17 to briefly go over the last meeting and the issues that were
18 raised.

19 Basically the first issue that was raised was that
20 the speed zones should be verified by engineering and
21 traffic surveys. It was pointed out that this is an
22 incorrect statement, so we did verify that. And now we have
23 deleted that particular statement from the current proposal
24 that you're going to see.

25 And the second comment that was made was that for

1 the work zone, work zone plaque will be used with the
2 regular speed limit signs, where permanent speed limit 24
3 hours around the clock, like either it's a roadway geometry
4 change or the motorists are at risk at all times because of
5 state construction.

6 And then the C17 are existing roadwork sign.
7 That'll be used only when the risk is to the workers. So
8 that that sign needs to be covered. And there are the CVC
9 references that we are trying to tie them to.

10 So the comment that was made at the last meeting
11 was that these signs be separated out as to which one is
12 around-the-clock type of need, which one is only when the
13 workers are at risk.

14 So accordingly we have modified the policy in the
15 proposal.

16 The third comment that was made was the use of
17 radar enforcement or other electronic methods. The comment
18 was made that CHP is allowed to use a LIDAR or RADAR in work
19 zones to enforce the speed limits. So, again, we have made
20 the changes accordingly in the proposal.

21 And a final comment that was made was that an
22 engineering and traffic survey need to be done in a work
23 zone when we are reducing the speed limits. And, again, we
24 have made some -- added to the proposal showing that when
25 the traffic engineer, a construction RE and the law

1 enforcement get together and based upon their conclusions,
2 they make the determination that constitutes, as long as
3 they document the reason why they're doing it, that
4 constitutes an engineering traffic survey, rather than our
5 typical engineering and traffic survey for reducing the
6 speed limits for regular roadways.

7 So all those four comments have been addressed in
8 the proposal.

9 And then on page 11 through 13 is a Caltrans legal
10 opinion regarding the, I would say, interpretation of the
11 California vehicle codes. And they are the California
12 vehicle code 22362 and 22354 and 21367. So they lay out
13 basically the -- and the gist of what that legal opinion is
14 saying is the highway agencies do have the authority to
15 regulate the movement of traffic through a work zone,
16 meaning they can reduce the speeds in case, based upon the
17 curvature or whatever the needs are, for the safety of the
18 motorist.

19 So, then the proposal that we have for the
20 Committee to look at and recommend -- review and recommend,
21 and that's the input that we are seeking right now is --
22 begins on page 14 of the agenda. And what you see in black
23 is what is existing national MUTCD text that the feds have
24 provided.

25 Then the blue text, just as a reminder for any new

1 folks, is what is the current California-created MUTCD text
2 that's already official.

3 And the red that you see is what we are coming in
4 with the proposal today. So going through that, and that's
5 pretty much the makeup of the proposal.

6 If you want, I can highlight a few areas of the
7 proposal, or I'll leave it up to the Committee if you want
8 any information from me.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Bhullar, it
10 may help if you highlight the changes with regard to those
11 specific four comments that you just mentioned.

12 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Do you have a color
14 coded of the minutes? Because mine is all black and white.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Is all color --

16 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, --

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You may want to
18 wait a couple seconds to --

19 MR. BHULLAR: Sure. Just very briefly --

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you very
21 much.

22 MR. BHULLAR: So starting with page 14 of the
23 agenda, if you read the support statement in red towards the
24 bottom there, this statement has been edited, going back and
25 forth. And basically what it says is the support language

1 does not have any policy or application. It just is there
2 to explain things.

3 So here what we did is to explain the gist of the
4 Caltrans legal interpretation. What we did is that what's
5 we said, CVC-22362 applies to when workers are present
6 condition; and that 21367 CVC says agencies can regulate the
7 movement of traffic whenever the traffic would endanger the
8 safety of workers or the work would interfere with or
9 endanger the movement of traffic through the area.

10 And what we drafted further is if obstruction
11 would be present throughout the project duration the signs
12 would not need to be covered or moved. And this would also
13 apply to situations where the construction work changes the
14 highway curvature or elevation making it necessary to post
15 reduced speed limits. So basically this is trying to
16 identify that.

17 And then on the next page also we added another
18 statement which is the speed limits in construction zones
19 could be reduced based on the collective judgment of the
20 traffic engineer, construction engineer and the enforcement
21 agency as long as the reasons are documented.

22 The studies made to identify these projects are
23 considered sufficient to satisfy the intent of the
24 engineering and traffic survey requirement.

25 So, clearly trying to state that basically this is

1 fulfilling that requirement. And pretty much I think that's
2 the gist of the changes. And we have deleted, on page 15,
3 towards the middle of the page there's a guidance. We did
4 delete that one line, which says, under the guidance second
5 sentence in the paragraph, the speed zone should be verified
6 by an engineering and traffic survey. That has been
7 deleted.

8 And I believe those were all the changes.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Good. Just one quick
10 question. In the paragraph on page 15, you're using traffic
11 engineer with capital letters. Is that like a typo or it's
12 intentional? The paragraph at the bottom on their standard,
13 saying the traffic engineer or their designee.

14 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, I do see that. Actually that's
15 a good question. I'm not sure. There was a proposal --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Because if you use
17 capitals then you're implying that it must be a registered
18 traffic engineer, which I think by state law, you cannot
19 anyways --

20 MR. BHULLAR: Which might not be the case. Yeah.
21 That's a good point. I also have it as a construction
22 engineer. I'm not sure if that's a typo, but I --

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I see traffic
24 engineer in capital in a couple places. You might want to
25 take a look at that. I'm sure other people have other

1 comments.

2 MR. BHULLAR: Sure.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Is that it, Mr.
4 Bhullar?

5 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

7 MR. BHULLAR: Just continuing on the next page,
8 let me point out that here, in section 6E1 is what I was
9 reading pretty much the policy for how you do this reduction
10 in speed zones.

11 Then on next page is where the actual device comes
12 in, which is section 6F104, and that's where we have both of
13 the devices, meaning one is the road work signs. And let me
14 show you which ones I'm referring to.

15 On page 9 of the agenda if you see the two signs
16 that I have highlighted in this circle, those are the two
17 signs with the work zone flag that goes up. That is the
18 sign that I've added to section 6F104. And basically that
19 sign and the policy is already proposed in the notice of
20 proposed amendments that have posted. So I'm taking it from
21 there and trying to keep it loosely or close to that.

22 So I'm not sure when it's going to become
23 official, but that sign on page 16 of the agenda, when you
24 see, that's where the policies of work zone plaque may be
25 mounted above a speed limit sign to emphasize that a

1 permanent, 24-hours-a-day, seven-days-a-week a reduced speed
2 limit is in effect.

3 Then the end work zone speed limit sign may be
4 installed at the downstream end.

5 However, then I'm making the distinction that on
6 page 17 I show the C17 sign. That is our current sign that
7 we use in work zones. So now we are making a distinction
8 when you read on page 16 under section 6F104, I'm saying the
9 road work speed limit C17 sign may be used for the
10 protection of workers during working hours for reduced speed
11 limits within a temporary traffic control zone.

12 So we're trying to create a distinction. C17 is
13 to protect the workers; and it needs to be covered when
14 there is no work activity. Whereas, the work zone plaque,
15 on a regular speed limit sign, is when you're permanently,
16 around-the-clock, reducing speeds through a construction,
17 either through staged construction, or maybe for the
18 duration of the project.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Good. Thank you
20 very much. Okay, any questions for Mr. Bhullar? Mr.
21 Babico.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yes. John, C17CA is not
23 going to be used on state facilities.

24 MR. BHULLAR: Okay, very good point. The answer
25 is actually we removed that distinction because, as you

1 know, we have been, over the years, trying to get away from
2 the, I would say the logic where we said, on state highways
3 do this, on local agencies do that.

4 So on the previous meeting on minutes, actually
5 the comments that were made on this item, at that time it
6 was pointed out that we should stay away from doing that.
7 So I checked the vehicle code. And in the past we used to
8 say that these signs were only to be used on local agencies,
9 not on state highways.

10 So, if you look at page 16 of your agenda right
11 now, --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah.

13 MR. BHULLAR: -- towards the middle there's a
14 standard. And the first line we have struck that out. And
15 that line says, the C17 sign shall not be used on state
16 highways. We have crossed that line out. So since there
17 was no California vehicle code dictating that this sign only
18 be used on local agencies, not on state highways. So now
19 it's only two sets of signs, regardless of whether it's a
20 state highway or not.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: On page 9 where you have
22 the R2-1 where you circled that, and R2-12, they are
23 specifically for the state highway, not for local.

24 MR. BHULLAR: Okay. No, actually, though, if you
25 read our policies, they do not say that the R2-1 and the R2-

1 12 are only for state highways.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: That's my next question,
3 because I'm not clear. You are saying that on state
4 facilities you can use work zone road work and you can use
5 work zone, depending. Right?

6 MR. BHULLAR: No.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No?

8 MR. BHULLAR: No policy in this proposal is trying
9 to say that the R2-1 or the R2-12 are only for state
10 highways.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, what I'm saying is
12 that for the state facilities you may use the signs on page
13 9 or the signs on page 17, which is road work.

14 MR. BHULLAR: That's correct.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Is that correct?

16 MR. BHULLAR: That's correct.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Then, on the same thing
18 on local streets you cannot use the signs on page 9?

19 MR. BHULLAR: No. We do not, in --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: We can?

21 MR. BHULLAR: -- our proposal, say that. For
22 local agencies you can do them both, as well.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay. Because 14 and 15
24 is not clear that these policies are for both Caltrans as
25 well as local agencies.

1 MR. BHULLAR: Well, because on page 14 and 15 --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Generally.

3 MR. BHULLAR: -- nowhere are we saying on state
4 highways. So those policies --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: That's right.

6 MR. BHULLAR: -- are applicable to any roadway.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay.

8 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah. I think, Jacob, probably the
9 confusion you are having is in the past we have that policy.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: That's right.

11 MR. BHULLAR: Even today we have that policy.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah.

13 MR. BHULLAR: So until the Committee recommends to
14 me, and I make this official, the C17 signs, right now the
15 current policy is not to be used on state highways. So we
16 are making that change.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: But the new
18 policy, that distinction is going to go away?

19 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: As long as we
21 don't say for state highway, then it applies to all the
22 streets.

23 Any other questions, Mr. Babico?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No. I'm still debating
25 with myself.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other
2 members?

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I just have a
4 couple of editorial comments. And then one that may be a
5 little bit more substantive.

6 On page 14, and again on page 17. Let's go to
7 page 14. In the red support statement near the bottom, this
8 is just an editorial comment, it reads in the middle of the
9 paragraph, if obstruction would be present. I think maybe
10 it was intended to say obstructions, plural? If
11 obstructions would be present?

12 MR. BHULLAR: Accepted.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: And if that's
14 the case, then you would also make that same change on page
15 16 near the top, the same change, an editorial change.

16 The second editorial change would be on page 15
17 under the guidance, the first guidance in red text. It says
18 construction zone speed limits should be reduced in
19 sequential stages where overall reduction. I just think you
20 meant to add the word "and" where an overall reduction of 15
21 miles an hour or more is required.

22 MR. BHULLAR: Actually, John, this was your
23 wording, so --

24 (Laughter.)

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Right, and I

1 may have left out the word "and".

2 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: So, --

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: A man is entitled
5 to improve himself --

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: When one reads
7 his own writing he'll never catch his own mistakes.

8 But the question I had was look at the support
9 statement right above that on page 15. It says the speed
10 limit could be reduced based on the collective judgment of
11 the traffic engineer, construction engineer and the
12 enforcement agency.

13 I would think we might wish to put that under the
14 next guidance statement and make it a should instead of a
15 could. We are talking about the establishment of a speed
16 limit. And rather than just having it as an informational
17 support statement, I would think we would want to make that
18 a guidance statement as to how the speed limit is
19 established.

20 MR. BHULLAR: I'm certainly open to that.
21 Actually I like that better.

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: So I would
23 move that we approve the item with that change.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Before you make a
25 motion do you want to see if anybody else has any other --

1 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Yes,
2 absolutely.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- to include in
4 your motion? Yeah, we go to public.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: You're right.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: But any other
7 comments before we move on from the other members and the
8 public? No? Nothing more for you.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Okay. If
10 that's --

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, let me go,
12 any members on this side? Any comments on the language, any
13 questions?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: On the same page where
15 John was recommending to change the support to guidance, and
16 where it says on that, the collective judgment of a traffic
17 engineer, construction engineer and law enforcement
18 engineer, is that will apply to the local streets, too?

19 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, it would. We're not making any
20 distinction throughout the policy, state or local agencies.
21 We are pretty much having policy applicable to our
22 roadways.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Reducing speed, why I
24 would like to go to construction engineer and the law
25 enforcement?

1 MR. BHULLAR: Because this is a determination
2 that's going to be made out in the field.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: But that is a design.
4 Before you construct, you prepare the design plans where the
5 reduced speed would be for the work zone. So prior to that
6 I have to go and do the collective judgment for reduction of
7 the speed for a construction zone?

8 MR. BHULLAR: Well, the way this is written is
9 that that is, if you're going to be designing it, then the
10 tools are available then. They do not have to follow
11 section 6C.01, most of the time, they can just go to 6F12-
12 104 where the devices are there, and they have the option to
13 use the devices. So the designers, most of the time the way
14 they design it is that any tools that are available in the
15 California MUTCD has those devices, they can just use them
16 based upon their engineering knowledge when they're
17 designing a project.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, then, why can't we
19 put some statement here in this guidance to say in lieu of
20 that we use the design plans?

21 MR. BHULLAR: Well, isn't that a given anyhow
22 because it's like --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Oh, no, it's not clear
24 to me.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: I can follow up, Mr.

1 Chairman. I agree with Jacob here. I really don't go talk
2 to my construction engineer on what the speed limit is. We
3 set that in the design and we go from there.

4 I don't have a sheriff's patrol in Santa Cruz
5 County; what I have is a CHP officer who patrols the county
6 for speeds. And normally I don't talk to him about that
7 particularly. I would have to engage him at that point.

8 I mean that's why I kind of -- I sort of go back
9 to the traffic engineering study. That's why I have a
10 traffic engineer there.

11 MR. BHULLAR: Basically my response to that would
12 be that in actually the traffic control plan section of the
13 part 6, basically it allows the designers to design their
14 stage construction and traffic control plans in any manner
15 they want.

16 Here, what's being discussed here is out in the
17 construction zone, when they, at that time, feel a need to
18 reduce the speed limits, this is how you do it.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Can we say then in lieu
20 of the collective judgment for the traffic engineer,
21 construction engineer and law enforcement, if there is a
22 design drawings or design study --

23 MR. BHULLAR: Sure, we can do that --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: -- that would be in lieu
25 of this judgment?

1 MR. BHULLAR: -- to clarify it. If you give me
2 some suggested text, I'm open to that. Anything to clarify
3 the application of the manual.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I hear where Mr.
5 Babico and Mr. Presleigh are coming from, because these are
6 all designed already by the time they make it to the field.
7 I think the idea is to get some flexibility to the resident
8 engineer, and that's a good one.

9 But then maybe the language, if you say the speed
10 limit in construction zone, may be further reduced,
11 something like that. For that where the construction plans
12 are already showing, if there is a need to further reduce.

13 MR. BHULLAR: There could be state construction
14 plans showing no reduction. And out in the field is when
15 you determine if it's posing danger to the workers, or maybe
16 it's even dangerous for the motorists, themselves.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, we may need
18 to work with the language, but I understand where they're
19 coming from. Let's listen to other people and then we'll
20 come back to this issue.

21 Start thinking about some language, Mr. Babico.

22 Yes.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'd like to follow
24 up --

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Hold on, hold on.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I wanted to follow up,
2 I guess, on what you just said. I'd like to know the
3 language because so often, at least at the city level, we
4 are making field engineering judgments during construction
5 because --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: That's right.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- things come up, and
8 they weren't on the original plan. So as long as you give
9 me some flexibility that without a full-blown design study
10 at the time we're preparing the plans, we have some
11 flexibility to field engineer these when things do come up
12 out in the field.

13 You know, when a detour goes down a road we
14 weren't expecting, and it's rough. There's a myriad of
15 things that could happen during construction.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Right, I agree with him.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Good point. No
18 other comments from the members? Mr. Singh, you had your
19 hand raised.

20 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: No, no.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No. Ms Wong,
22 Jeff?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: No, I agree. I think
24 the whole point for having that clause in there is to give
25 that discretion, not having to redo some whole TS when those

1 unexpected things come up. So there has to be some method
2 to do that on the fly, in the field when you need it.

3 But I also understand the concerns. You don't
4 want to be locked into having to do that when you're
5 originally setting up your plan, to begin with.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Good points. If
7 there are no comments I'm going to open the public hearing
8 part of this. Okay, Mr. Helmer.

9 MR. HELMER: Can we do it from our chair --

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, no, no. We
11 are recording the meeting. Again, you know, we all know who
12 you are because you introduced yourself. But for the
13 purpose of the minutes, if you reintroduce so we know who
14 made what comment.

15 MR. HELMER: Jim Helmer, Director of
16 Transportation, City of San Jose. I always had a very very
17 keen and strong interest in the safety of our workers,
18 safety of the motorists, and just general overall ability to
19 reduce tragic incidents in work construction zones.

20 The first question I'd like to ask is if the law
21 enforcement agency is using LIDAR or RADAR in the work zone
22 does that mean that you would then need to pursue within the
23 work zone to make the stop.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I don't understand
25 the --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: If you're using RADAR
2 would you position yourself within the work zone and then
3 make a pursuit starting within the work zone to make the
4 necessary stop of the speeding motorist?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I think you're using
6 the term pursuit pretty loosely. You would have to follow -
7 - you would have to get behind the car and effect the stop,
8 so, yes, at some point you would have to get out into
9 traffic and -- if you weren't already moving, with a moving
10 RADAR mode.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Are you talking about
13 pacing?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: No, I'm not talking
15 about pacing, but I'm bring to our collective attention that
16 when we use conventional RADAR or LIDAR, we are going to
17 have a situation where now we're going to have to hit the
18 accelerator and go through that work construction zone to
19 make the necessary stop to pull the motorist over who's
20 violating the law.

21 So, I'd like us to remain open in our language
22 that if automated speed enforcement technology is ever
23 legalized, that this is written in such a way that you do
24 not have to go back for months of hearings to insert that.

25 This is not to say that it will be legalized, but

1 if it is, you could actually take care of that clause today
2 by putting that conditional sentence in there.

3 Thank you.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Good comment,
5 thank you. Anyone else? Mr. Shanteau.

6 DR. SHANTEAU: In my real life I'm a traffic
7 engineer, consulting traffic engineer. And I've
8 investigated many collisions in --

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- introduce
10 yourself.

11 DR. SHANTEAU: I'm Bob Shanteau. And I've
12 investigated many collisions in work zones. Actually, Mr.
13 Babico, thank you very much for bringing that subject up
14 about the -- what about when you already have a traffic
15 control plan, what do you do about changing this temporary
16 speed limit.

17 My question would be I thought that was already
18 covered, that the temporary speed limit is already in the
19 traffic control plan. And if you have to make a field
20 change, then don't you have to change the traffic control
21 plan?

22 I mean otherwise you'd have this -- you're saying
23 you have to document any change in the speed limit. But
24 isn't that part of the traffic control plan?

25 And right at the beginning -- Mr. Singh, could you

1 bring up the beginning of part 6 of the California MUTCD?
2 Where it talks about the necessity and the importance of
3 a -- I'm talking about the first paragraph.

4 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Which page?

5 DR. SHANTEAU: Page 6A1.

6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Okay. Right there.

7 DR. SHANTEAU: Um-hum.

8 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: It's easier reading it
9 on the slide.

10 DR. SHANTEAU: I can see it here.

11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Let me blow it up.

12 DR. SHANTEAU: The needs and control of all road
13 users, motorcycles, bicycles and pedestrians of the highway,
14 including persons with disabilities and so forth, shall be
15 an essential part of highway construction, utility work,
16 maintenance, operations and management of traffic incidents.

17 And then we get down to where it starts talking
18 about the traffic control plan. That may be -- yeah, TTC's
19 planning, temporary traffic control planning, provides for
20 continuity of movement of motor vehicle and so forth and so
21 on.

22 In other words, I'm asking what, on the fly,
23 decisions for traffic control in construction? I mean the
24 traffic control plan sets out what should happen. If you
25 have changes that are to be made in the field you change the

1 traffic control plan, and then you make the change in the
2 field.

3 Isn't that -- that's the way I read this. And I
4 don't understand how people just make changes on the fly in
5 the field. You're opening yourself wide open for liability
6 in that case.

7 You know, I'm trying to prevent accidents. Maybe
8 I'm also trying to prevent some work for myself, but I'm
9 trying to prevent accidents and injuring people. After all,
10 you're protecting the public, as well as the workers.

11 Okay, in all the cases I've had, I've never had
12 a -- I don't think -- I think I've had one worker injured.
13 But the others have all been to the public.

14 So, I'm a bit concerned that the wording here,
15 even though that's what -- I know that's what the vehicle
16 code says, about referring to protection of the workers, but
17 I'm also concerned about protection to the public. And
18 isn't that, both protection to the workers and the public is
19 what the traffic control plan is all about.

20 So, I would think this would be at the traffic
21 control plan level, just --

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

23 DR. SHANTEAU: -- which means I would agree with
24 Mr. Babico.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thank you

1 for your comment. Anyone else? Mr. Roseman.

2 MR. ROSEMAN: David Roseman, City Traffic Engineer
3 for Long Beach. I just want to point out that similar to
4 the discussion we had on speed limits before, ultimately,
5 you know, there could be an enforcement component to this.

6 And I think that the language that talks on page
7 15 about having a jointly approved traffic control or speed
8 limit from a construction engineer and traffic engineer, it
9 really should be the traffic engineer consulting, like it
10 says in the language, not having a joint sign-off. That
11 would be my suggestion.

12 And also I just, out of curiosity, I would think
13 that it might be best for Caltrans to ultimately, not
14 through this process, but to set a standard for what that
15 type of form or sign-off would look like. Because that
16 would probably be helpful to a lot of construction
17 engineers, as well as traffic engineers. Thanks.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.
19 Both comments are well taken.

20 LT. DISCHER: Good morning. Donald Discher,
21 Sunnyvale Police. Normally I don't take the podium, but
22 we're excited about this change to the manual, as well.

23 I'm going to second on the enforcement side. I
24 don't need a phone call or traffic consultation from our
25 traffic engineer. They don't for DTS. I trust them

1 implicitly. They do it. I get the certified copy. We go
2 enforce it. I don't need to be consulted. You guys are the
3 professionals and we trust your engineering practices
4 without fail.

5 The only other question I had is the last red
6 sentence in that same group: Contracted law enforcement
7 should provide construction zones --

8 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Which page?

9 LT. DISCHER: Oh, sorry, page 15. The very last
10 red sentence: Contracted law enforcement should provide
11 construction zone enhanced enforcement in the TTC zone.

12 I don't quite understand what that means or the
13 relevance of it, or why we'd need that.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's a good
15 question. We're going to come back to it. Johnny, you want
16 to say something?

17 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. Just
18 in response to that, that comes from COZEEP, so that's a
19 Caltrans -- what we tried to do is at least take that a
20 little bit out so that this policy doesn't pertain as if
21 it's only for Caltrans. And basically the COZEEP program
22 was, and this is why the wording was changed a little bit,
23 is that a local agency or Caltrans, whenever you do a COZEEP
24 type of program where you contract out with a law
25 enforcement agency to enforce your work zone, we are saying

1 in that particular case contracted law enforcement should
2 provide that type of enforcement within the zone.

3 If it's normal roadway, before, after, or even
4 during that, fine. But if you're going to have a law
5 enforcement personnel within the work zone, stationed within
6 the work zone, they be contracted to do that. That's where
7 the --

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I can see that it
9 can potentially pose some problems where some cities, for
10 example, contract with sheriff's department. But the law
11 enforcement that sheriff department does is restricted to
12 nontraffic. And then they use CHP.

13 And then counties, for example, they have -- it
14 can become very confusing, and it can open up a big can of
15 worms. So I'm glad you brought it up.

16 I don't know if the benefits are outweighing the
17 confusion. We'll talk about it when we come back.

18 MR. BHULLAR: Well, I'm open to even taking the
19 sentence out. That's --

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: We're just taking
21 notes of all the comments. We're going to bring it back to
22 the Committee. Anybody else? Yes, sir.

23 MR. CARUSO: Peter Caruso. Orange County. I have
24 two comments from things I see in these construction zones
25 often. Probably you guys do, too.

1 One is because of the temporary nature often of
2 these closures you see the construction workers putting out
3 these signs that come out on foldable dollies, often for the
4 surface streets.

5 And sometimes these signs are posted two, three
6 feet off the ground. I'd like to see a language saying that
7 even though it should be a given to a traffic engineer, this
8 needs to be seven feet minimum that these speed limit signs
9 need to be at standard height.

10 Second of all, often I see, for example there's
11 one right where I live, there's a three-lane road. They
12 close it, they put up these signs, but they don't look at
13 the signal timing. There's no increased signal timing, so
14 you have an enormous queue develop.

15 And I'm wondering if, as part of this, that maybe
16 a shall review the signal timing at the area to give, so we
17 don't -- the one thing is the longer the queue the more
18 likely you are to have rear-end accidents. And those are my
19 comments.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Bhullar.

21 MR. BHULLAR: First, -- Johnny Bhullar with
22 Caltrans. I'd like to respond to the first comment.
23 Actually that is already done, I believe, in section 6F02,
24 if I'm not mistaken. And that sets in work zones are not
25 actually, I would say, immune to the national MUTCD standard

1 of requiring seven feet minimum height of signs out on the
2 roadways, and five feet in rural, but seven feet whenever
3 there are pedestrians.

4 And we constantly get -- last year I got probably
5 six or seven calls on citations, especially in the Santa
6 Rosa area where people have been cited for speed limits and
7 doubling of fines in work zones. But the signs were way
8 down there and they couldn't even see them because of the
9 cars.

10 And what I point out to them is section 6F02 where
11 it says -- and it's a shall requirement, so it does not
12 given an out -- and basically, let me see if I can quickly
13 get to it.

14 Okay, actually it's 6F03, and this is where it
15 says ground-mounted signs installed at the side of the
16 roadway in rural areas shall be mounted at least five feet,
17 measured from the bottom of the sign. And then it says
18 seven feet for other locations.

19 So, it's already there. And that's all you need
20 to fight a ticket, but, of course, we try to educate the
21 engineers not to do it in the first place.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

23 MR. CARUSO: What about if they do this advice on
24 a barrel as opposed to a post?

25 MR. BHULLAR: Barrel or post is more of a crash-

1 worthy criteria of the device, itself. But what we talk
2 about is for the visual sign, or the visibility or
3 legibility of the sign. It has to be minimum five feet.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.
5 Any other members of the public? Yes, sir.

6 MR. PYBURN: Yes, Steve Pyburn with Federal
7 Highway Administration. Being a licensed civil and traffic
8 engineer in the state, my concern is about the use of
9 construction engineer.

10 I was just looking at the board rules on
11 engineering, construction engineer is not defined under
12 California law.

13 Therefore, to eliminate confusion the requirement
14 falls to the RE or -- the resident engineer or the civil
15 engineer that's in responsible charge of the plans. That
16 confusion should be clarified.

17 As a practitioner, seeing construction engineer
18 brings a bit of confusion on my part in the past. The
19 traffic control plan should be developed as part of the
20 design drawings considering everything that a setting of
21 speed limit traffic operation should consider.

22 But, if adjustments need to be made in the field
23 because of how things are operating that needs to be done in
24 consultation with the design engineer and the resident
25 engineer. The CHP, traffic engineer could be consulted, but

1 they don't have the authority really to alter traffic
2 operations under California law.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.

4 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. Just
5 a quick comment. For those of you who might not have
6 realized it, Steve Pyburn is our new --

7 MR. PYBURN: As if anybody could be --

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Welcome, we're
9 glad to have you.

10 MR. PYBURN: Thank you.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Hopefully we'll
12 get better treatment from FHWA now.

13 (Laughter.)

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Say hello to Matt
15 for us.

16 Okay, any other members of the public? Okay,
17 seeing none, I close the public hearing, bringing back to
18 the Committee.

19 Colleagues, we received quite a few comments in
20 addition to what you guys have already brought up. So, who
21 is the brave person who wants to take -- Mr. Babico.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I would like to make the
23 revised language following recommendation of John Fisher to
24 change on page 15 the first in red, support with the
25 guidance. It reads: The speed limit in construction zone

1 should be reduced based on the traffic control plans, or the
2 collective judgment of the traffic engineer, civil engineer
3 and the law enforcement agencies." Then it will continue.

4 Going back on the same page under the guidance in
5 red, the second paragraph, I think we should delete that.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: The one that says
7 construction zone speed limit?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Say the traffic engineer
9 or the designee should analyze prevailing speeds through the
10 TCC zones, and then again it gives that joint construction
11 engineer and California Highway Patrol. There is no need
12 for that, except this would apply to the state facilities.
13 That's different.

14 And with regard to the comments at the last
15 sentence of the same paragraph, the contracted law
16 enforcement, if Caltrans would like to have it, well, that
17 is stated to be clear for highway state facilities only.
18 But is not required -- and the contract has already been
19 defined when they signed the contract between the local
20 agency for Caltrans and the law enforcement. So there is no
21 need to modify or mention it here.

22 With regard to the consulting with the law
23 enforcement, well, I mean if we don't have the plans, then
24 there would be some consultation in the field.

25 With regard to the vertical clearance, as has been

1 discussed, I mean it's clear we have to abide with the
2 minimum requirements of installing signs.

3 As for the signal timing, that should be covered
4 under the traffic control --

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, well --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: -- plans.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Babico, can I
8 stop you here?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yes, sir.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Are these all
11 part of your motion, or are you making remarks on your own
12 motion?

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, I'm responding to
14 the public comment that --

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: But you made a
16 motion. What is the motion that --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I didn't say motion. I
18 said that --

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You're just
20 discussing it, okay, good.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Go ahead, I'm done.

22 (Laughter.)

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, Mr. Fisher.

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I think we
25 heard a lot of good comments, and I started thinking about

1 how we implement detours in my agency. And we have major
2 projects, lightrail projects that are underway, grade
3 separation projects, major sewer and water replacement
4 projects.

5 And every time that there's a need to do
6 something, a change in the field or on the fly, what we do
7 is we revise the work site traffic control plan or TTC. So
8 if the contractor says, I can't do it this way, I need to do
9 it that way. We say, okay, hold on; let's prepare a plan;
10 let's get it signed by our registered engineer. And then we
11 implement the new plan.

12 So everything is implemented pursuant to the TTC
13 in making a revised TTC. But, it's an amended TTC.

14 So I would want to see if we can get a consensus
15 here that any speed limit we establish in the work zone is
16 pursuant to a signed TTC, whether it's an amended one or the
17 original one that we develop.

18 And I think if we can agree on that, then we can
19 agree on maybe the language that we want to see pursuant to
20 that.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Very good point.
22 Let's focus on that.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: But one thing here is
24 sometimes we do have a very small size of project
25 construction that it doesn't need to go through all these

1 design criterias or something. And contractors can come up
2 with a 8.5-by-11 sheet and say, hey, this is what I will do
3 that. And then we agree. Rather than going to the
4 registered engineer to prepare for a small job, okay, all
5 these traffic control plans.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Let me comment
7 on that. Yes, indeed, we have like a number of small
8 utility projects where they block a lane for three hours and
9 they do minor work and they cone it off. But it's in
10 accordance with a standard drawing in the California MUTCD
11 or the watch manual. There is a standard drawing that
12 guides how you cone it off and where you put the lane-closed
13 sign and those types of things.

14 I wouldn't think, though, that we would allow a
15 utility or a contractor to lower the speed limit for a
16 three-hour job.

17 So, here we're discussing changing the speed
18 limit. To me it should be pursuant to a TTC and signed by a
19 registered engineer. I just want to see if we can get
20 consensus on that.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's a very
22 good point. Let's go around the table and see.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: In reviewing this
24 particular language I went back to the Caltrans attorney's
25 letter to see whether he made any mention -- he or she -- of

1 the construction engineer, whether that's where that
2 language came from, or the enforcement agency.

3 And it really doesn't. Because, I mean, the issue
4 here is what qualifies as an ETS for the purpose of
5 enforcement. And what the attorney is saying is it's the
6 traffic engineer's call.

7 Now, quite often we do consult with enforcement.
8 I generally find that civil engineers rely on traffic
9 engineers for recommendations regarding speed limits. And
10 that typically they're not experts at setting the speed
11 limit on the street, and wouldn't be called to testify about
12 that.

13 So, without actually stating the fact that general
14 practice, since traffic engineers can't do any enforcement,
15 we always work with PD. I wouldn't state that here, but in
16 light of what the attorney is saying, I would keep this as,
17 you know, based on the judgment of the traffic engineer.
18 And that it needs to be documented. And that's really all
19 the attorney is saying.

20 We naturally consult with other people involved.
21 We consult with the contractor who's going to maintain the
22 signs on the 24-hour basis. We consult with the enforcement
23 agency. But I don't know -- we even talk to the
24 construction engineer because, of course, there might be a
25 change order cost involved. You know, we talk to everybody.

1 But it's really the judgment of the traffic
2 engineer that determines the speed limit. I think that's
3 what the attorney's saying.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So you agree with
5 Mr. Fisher's --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No, because he's going
7 beyond what the attorney's requiring.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Mr. Chairman.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Babico.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: One thing I would like
12 to correct, what Jeff stated, that a civil engineer can act
13 as a traffic engineer, too.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let's just --
15 let's -- okay -- maybe they need to act as engineer, this
16 engineer, the traffic engineer, by the state of California,
17 you cannot require traffic engineer to do anything, period.

18 The state of California does not recognize traffic
19 engineer as a practice act. So you cannot mandate in any
20 legal document that this document or that document must be
21 signed by a traffic engineer.

22 That's why I brought up the point about the
23 capital T. There are some --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: It was a capital T.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah. We've been

1 trying to do it for the last five years. But having said
2 that, there are some terms that are generic, like when you
3 say resident engineer. It's the engineer in charge of the
4 operation in the field. So we can go with that. Or
5 construction engineer. These are like generic terms,
6 they're not defined by the state.

7 But I don't want us to get into the long debate
8 about what traffic engineers do, what civil engineers do.

9 Let's go with a show of hands. How many of you
10 agree with Mr. Fisher's basic premise that once the
11 temporary traffic control plan is signed and revised, that
12 is the authorizing document to change the speed limit in the
13 work zone?

14 Start with Jeff. Do you agree with that premise?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It might be it doesn't
16 work in all cases.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- make a quick
19 judgment --

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, I
21 understand that. Ms. Wong?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: I really don't have
23 enough --

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Chief?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: It makes sense to me.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Wayne?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I think it's overkill.

3 In other words I sort of agree with Jeff.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Jeff? That you
5 need sometimes, at the heat of the moment. We know how you
6 feel. Mr. Presleigh.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: Yeah, I agree
8 with Jeff. On a lot of our projects -- or, John, I'm sorry
9 -- I agree with you on a lot of stuff, but there are smaller
10 projects that we have very small traffic control plans and
11 we make adjustments, so.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Good point. And
13 Mr. Babico?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Ditto what he said.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: If you look at the first
17 chapter, I mean the first paragraph under support it says
18 the reasons are documented. Now, if you document it in the
19 TTC or the document, the traffic control plan, it's
20 documented, right? If you document it under some kind of an
21 understanding here between the engineer and whoever else is
22 involved with that decision, that's documented, also. And I
23 think both ways would be adequate.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah, but you don't need
25 that language. So if you go back to collective judgment.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Didn't you guys
2 agree that a reduction in the speed zone should only be for
3 projects and jobs that are big and long enough to require a
4 temporary traffic control? --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: That's what I'm
6 saying --

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That as Mr.
8 Fisher said, you don't want a utility company to go out
9 there for a 24-hour job and reduce the speed limit just
10 because they're out there.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, they can't reduce
12 it. It's the city engineer or the local agency, themselves,
13 they have the authority. Not any local --

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: -- utilities, they just
16 go and jump on the speed and reduce it.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, so, for
18 your projects, do you agree that any project that requires a
19 reduction in the speed zone definitely has a temporary
20 traffic control plan going with it?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, yeah, but not in
22 the sense that you have to prepare the TTC plans. I mean it
23 could be a verbal agreement between the agency and who is
24 doing the work, or their own task force, the agency's task
25 force, they can do it.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Where do
2 you want to go? I don't sense we're being ready to do
3 something with this today. Mr. Presleigh.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: Just a general
5 comment. When we prepare plans and specs we do have a sign-
6 off for the construction engineer or the residential
7 engineer. We have a sign-off by the traffic engineer, sign
8 off by the director and so on.

9 Where I don't have a sign-off is with the local
10 law enforcement for speed control. And that probably is my
11 basic objective. I don't want to consult with them
12 necessarily on most of these smaller projects.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And that one, Mr.
14 Bhullar, if you'd come to the podium, please. Where did
15 this consultation or collective wisdom idea come from?
16 Because I'm hearing from the law enforcement that if the
17 resident engineer or the people who are in charge of the
18 construction in that area, they think they have to reduce
19 the speed limit in that area, they trust their judgment.

20 Why do we need to introduce another set of
21 complication?

22 MR. BHULLAR: Well, the reason why this proposal
23 came about was from Caltrans at the beginning of
24 construction because procedurally that's how they do it.
25 Caltrans probably because of our bigger projects or more

1 higher speeds. They normally, whenever they want to do
2 something like this, they do consult almost as a procedure
3 with the law enforcement --

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let me ask you
5 this. If you -- let me finish, Mr. Babico -- so if you
6 exclude that requirement it does not stop them from doing
7 it?

8 MR. BHULLAR: No.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: But by adding
10 something like that, then we have to sit here and wordsmith
11 this thing to death to make sure that everybody's okay, all
12 the locals on small projects.

13 So if you take any reference to consultation or
14 coordination or anything with law enforcement, it's not
15 going to stop Caltrans from doing what it's already doing.
16 True?

17 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, that's true.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It doesn't
19 preclude you --

20 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah, we were just trying to lay out
21 our procedure and --

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, but --

23 MR. BHULLAR: -- how we try to do it --

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, because
25 when you say --

1 MR. BHULLAR: -- and extend it --

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Because when you
3 say then the question becomes so what does it mean. Do I
4 have to make a phone call? Do I have to get a letter from
5 them? What about if they're not available? Chief.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I agree. For something
7 procedurally Caltrans does when they plan it, then that can
8 be covered in the Caltrans policy manual or whatever, and
9 not add to the confusion of what's being imposed upon the
10 local agencies.

11 I would just like to comment, though, on what Mr.
12 Babico was saying. That I understand, without understanding
13 the whole process you go through to come up with your
14 traffic control plan and the engineering behind it, the idea
15 that some of these speed limits or reduced speed limits are
16 set based on some kind of a verbal agreement is not going to
17 work for law enforcement.

18 It's going to have to be documented somewhere
19 because to be able to use RADAR and LIDAR we have to have an
20 ETS, a valid ETS. And what we're saying is that if you, in
21 the analysis of your construction project, have determined
22 that a reduced speed is appropriate, then we're good with
23 that. That is a valid ETS as far as we're concerned. But
24 it's got to be written down somewhere and it can't be just
25 some handshake agreement in the back --

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, the way
2 that it works is that the reduction of the speed zone in the
3 construction work area, you still need an ETS. You do not
4 need to comply with the 85th percentile requirement. Still,
5 some engineer should look at it, and you can't just willy
6 nilly go around on a freeway post it 25 miles per hour and
7 say, I think that's good.

8 So, you need an ETS, but compliance with the 85th
9 percentile is not there. Mr. Babico, and then Mr. Fisher.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay, the easy way out
11 of this, all these pages, if they are related to the state
12 facilities, then there's not any doubt or not any
13 discussions. Because this is based to implement based on
14 the state routes and freeways. Why? Because California
15 vehicle code, in order to establish speed for state
16 facilities, CHP has to approve them.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Consult, not
18 approve.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Consult, okay. Whatever
20 is approval. There is a word approval somewhere in that
21 section of the California vehicle code.

22 So I believe what it meant on this is all related
23 to the state facilities, not local. So if we distinguish
24 that, everything will be --

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, we have to

1 keep moving with this. If it's not going to go anywhere
2 today, I don't want to spend a half a day discussing
3 something that we're not going to approve. Mr. Fisher.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I'm going to
5 try again and I'm going to agree with what our
6 representative from the Highway Patrol said.

7 I think if you look at the language on page 14,
8 section 6C.01, it is intended that a reduced speed zone not
9 be made casually. It's not a wink-and-a-handshake type of
10 an agreement, or a verbal that's made on the fly. It goes
11 through a process.

12 If you look at the second paragraph, it says a
13 reduction of more than 10 miles per hour in the speed limit
14 should be used only where, only when required by restricted
15 features of the TTC zone.

16 And then you look at the next paragraph, reduced
17 speed zoning should be avoided as much as practical, because
18 drivers will reduce speeds only if they clearly perceive a
19 need to do so.

20 This suggests that we have to take speed limit
21 reduction very seriously and have to go through a process of
22 documenting why we're doing it. That's what it says to me.

23 So I think the easy way to resolve this issue, for
24 me, would be to perhaps strike the support language in red
25 on page 15, and maybe under section 6C.01 just add a simple

1 sentence.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Section?

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: 6C.01 on page
4 14. A simple sentence, something to the effect that the
5 justification for the reduced speed zone shall be documented
6 in writing.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And then get rid
8 of the -- get rid of the big paragraph on page 15 under
9 standard also? Where it says construction engineer should
10 observe blah, blah, blah, all that?

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Yes. Yes.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There's a lot of
13 language. The more language you add to the standard you
14 always introduce confusion.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Right. And so
16 if there is a need to revise the speed limit, you've
17 implemented it. And you say, I think the work zone speed
18 limit should be 40, but you realize that isn't working. And
19 you go back to your TTC plan and you change the speed limit
20 to 35 because that makes more sense. Then you have a
21 revised TTC and you've documented your reasons and why you
22 are putting in the 35.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: We have already
24 spent an hour and 15 minutes on this. If we are going to
25 resolve it in the next five minutes, we are resolving it.

1 Otherwise I'm going to table it and move, because we don't
2 want to spend all day on one item.

3 So, if you are ready to make a motion, Mr. Fisher,
4 go ahead and make a motion so we can pass this. Otherwise,
5 we will move on.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Okay. I move
7 that we strike the red support language on page 15, and that
8 we strike the red guidance language in the middle of page
9 15. That would be this red language. Okay. Guidance
10 language in the middle of page 15.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And then the
12 paragraph at the bottom?

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Yes. That's
14 part of the red language. And that we add a sentence on
15 page 14, under section 6C.01, that says, that adds to the
16 paragraph the justification for the reduced speed limit
17 shall be documented in writing.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Shall be
19 documented -- the second paragraph?

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Yes. It would
21 be at the end of the second paragraph.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: At the end of the
23 second paragraph you say the justification for reduction in
24 speed limit shall be documented.

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: In writing.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- paragraphs not
2 talking about.

3 MR. SPEAKER: It will be a shall.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Yeah, okay.
5 Yeah, it would be another paragraph and it would be a shall.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It would be a
7 shall.

8 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: It would be a
9 shall only because we've gone to great lengths to require
10 that reduced speed zoning further purposes be documented in
11 writing, as well.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, so that's
13 your motion. I have a motion. Is there a second? At least
14 for the purpose of discussion, is there a second?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I second it.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Remember,
17 if you second a motion it doesn't mean you have to vote for
18 it.

19 Okay, there is a motion and a second. Okay. Any
20 discussion -- basically pretty much what Mr. Fisher, I
21 think, is suggesting is to simplify this, keep it simple.
22 Just get rid of all this language, and all the confusion.
23 Just say if you have a speed zone reduction in a
24 construction zone, you shall document it.

25 And then if you document it, there's a memo to the

1 design file, so be it. If you document it in an email from
2 a traffic engineer to a resident engineer, that's
3 documentation. If you change you TTC, that's documentation.
4 Give flexibility. Is that correct? Is my understanding
5 correct, Mr. Fisher, is where you're going with this?

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Yeah, just --

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: With flexibility
8 you still have some protection.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Right. I just
10 think you have to write a statement that says why you are
11 reducing it.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Why you're doing
13 it. Yeah, that can be done --

14 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Right.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And then if
16 you're filing with local law enforcement or CHP, just keep
17 on doing what you're doing. Nothing in the manual stops
18 you.

19 Okay. A motion and a second. Discussion?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I could agree with
21 that. I think the only thing we lose by striking all of the
22 first red support paragraph on page 15 is the last sentence.

23 Because the typical civil engineer or traffic engineer
24 won't have a copy of the attorney's findings about what
25 covers the need for an ETS. And we have a sentence there

1 that's important to the like the traffic engineer.

2 The studies made to identify these projects, you
3 know, are considered sufficient to satisfy the intent of ETS
4 requirement. And that's important to have in this document.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Do you want to
6 make maybe a friendly amendment to say that this
7 documentation will satisfy the intent of the ETS
8 requirement?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I would propose a
10 completely alternative motion.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, so let's
12 see what happens with this motion. If it fails, we're going
13 to go to -- or you want to make a substantive motion?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, it seems like on
15 page 15 the only thing we got hung up on really was what is
16 documented. And some people wanted it on the traffic
17 control plan. And other people said, you know, for small
18 projects or emergency, you know, on-the-fly sorts of
19 decisions that need to be made, a smaller memo to file might
20 cover that. And we really got just bogged down really then
21 in just documentation.

22 But actually, in listening to everything, I don't
23 know that there's a fundamental disagreement with the
24 language on page 55 in terms of general practice that we
25 really do consult with these people. It's consistent with

1 other language in blue already that talked about the traffic
2 engineer and construction engineer.

3 You know, right above the lower red paragraph that
4 talks about the speed limit and zone sign should be
5 installed at locations jointly agreed upon by the traffic
6 engineer and the construction engineer.

7 So really what's said in red throughout page 15 is
8 consistent with the other types of language found throughout
9 this section. And if we just kind of agree that there's
10 different ways we can document this for different projects,
11 sometimes it's a traffic control plan, sometimes it's a
12 small project memo to file.

13 But I would make the motion that we adopt the
14 language as it's actually written, including all of page 15.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There is an
16 alternate motion introduced. Is there a second for the
17 alternate motion? Any second for the alternate motion?
18 Seeing none, that alternate motion dies.

19 Let's go back to the --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Good try.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- first -- let's
22 go back to the motion that we have on the floor already.
23 Okay. Let's vote and move on.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'd like to have the
25 sentence that we're going to insert read, so it can -- what

1 is that sentence going to say?

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Could you repeat
3 the sentence, Mr. Fisher?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: The justification for --

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Well, I'll
6 repeat it, and maybe based on what I heard I'm going to add
7 a few words in --

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, that's all
9 right.

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: It would be
11 considered editorial. The justification for the reduced
12 speed limit shall be documented in writing, in satisfaction
13 of the ENTS requirement.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- section of the
15 intent of the --

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Intent,
17 whatever, of the ENTS requirement.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, so the
19 motion is to get rid of all this red stuff on page 15 and
20 introduce that sentence that Mr. Fisher just read at the end
21 of paragraph 2 under item 6C.01 on page 14.

22 That's the motion and it has already a second. We
23 had discussion. Any more discussion?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I have one more
25 question, and this is to Johnny.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Go ahead.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Does this capture all,
3 you know, there's been two years of comments on this. Does
4 this pretty well cover it, in other words?

5 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, it still covers it, and I can
6 understand the Committee's take here is pretty much for some
7 of our internal procedures, we were just trying to spell
8 them out so that it's clear. And maybe for the local
9 agencies going forward, we are still going forward. So I'm
10 still okay with taking that stuff out.

11 Our big intent here was to get the work zone
12 plaque for the permanent and the other results. So that's
13 the main key areas we want those policies.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's a good
15 point that you brought up. I think that you guys, with all
16 very good intentions, started introducing a lot of your
17 internal policies into the manual. And the minute you do
18 that, then it becomes a state law. And then every small
19 city for every small project they have to do it the way
20 you're doing it, and it becomes complicated. That's why
21 maybe simplifying it is easier.

22 And then if you want to have like another manual
23 on your own policy, or if a county or a city has their own
24 internal policy, let them do it. Nothing stops them from
25 doing it.

1 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. All
2 right. Another way of saying it is that whenever some
3 changes come like this, Caltrans try to share with you how
4 we do it with our higher standards. And if you local
5 agencies want to either give us your input, we can take it
6 out. Or otherwise sometimes it's something good that
7 everyone can follow.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Motion and
9 a second. End of discussion. Let's move on.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I have a question.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, sir.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: On page 15 in the
13 middle, after the red standard, there's an option given in
14 example. That example is -- fits the state facilities, not
15 local. But I know the intent of that.

16 I mean shouldn't we give something which is more
17 generally used?

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: What example you
19 are talking about?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I mean how sequentially
21 you reduce the speed from 65 down to 45.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, that's --

23 MR. BHULLAR: I can fix it to show some local
24 speed. All I have to do is change the number.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Would you please. It's

1 much better to represent everybody.

2 MR. BHULLAR: Okay, what would be the suggestion,
3 say from 55 to 40?

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah. Change it
5 from 55 to 40. As long as there's a 15-mile reduction you
6 can do it in one shot; you have to do sequent. Okay.

7 Last call for discussion or questions,
8 clarifications. Okay, seeing none -- I'm not even looking
9 -- okay.

10 (Laughter.)

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So we have a
12 motion and we have a second. Let's see if it passes.

13 All those in favor of Mr. Fisher's motion, say
14 aye.

15 (Ayes.)

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: All those
17 opposed? No? That's good. Any abstention?

18 Okay, the motion passes unanimously after an hour
19 and 30 minutes. Thank you, Mr. Bhullar.

20 Let's move on to item --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: So we are done now with
22 07-17?

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's right.

24 (Laughter.)

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Hey, we did it.

1 (Parties speaking simultaneously.)

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: After two years
3 we are done.

4 Okay. 09-17. The California MUTCD revision to
5 include national limits CD03 revision number 2 maintaining
6 traffic sign retroreflectivity and other miscellaneous
7 policies. Mr. Henley.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay, we've got two
9 things going here. Number one, of course, this is
10 maintaining traffic sign retroreflectivity. Came out as a
11 revision about two years ago, a little over two years ago.

12 And so we, by law, have to have that incorporated
13 in the California MUTCD within two years, which is coming
14 up.

15 While we're doing that, there's a whole bunch of
16 changes, little changes we've made over the last two or
17 three years, and some errata. And there's a bunch of other
18 things that we wanted to change.

19 Now, we've sent that out. Everybody in this room
20 should have seen the proposed changes. And Johnny is going
21 to talk a little bit about where we go from here.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, Mr.
23 Bhullar.

24 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans.
25 Basically, this is page 18 of 55 on the agenda. And what we

1 are dealing with here is the MUTCD, the national MUTCD, the
2 revision number 2. That is actually the main reason why we
3 have this item, because of the code of federal regulations
4 requires the states, including us, anytime they issue an --
5 revision. And when it becomes effective, within two years
6 we have to change our manual to reflect that.

7 And in this case what happened is this revision
8 number 2 became effective January 22nd of 2008. So, by
9 January 21st or 22nd of 2010 we have no choice but to at
10 least have the retroreflective element which was the
11 revision 2 included in our manual.

12 But we are also taking this as an opportunity,
13 because it's been three years since we changed our manual,
14 to do some of the changes.

15 So the first change, of course, is we are putting
16 in the revision number 2. The second thing that we are
17 doing is there have been a lot of CTCDC recommendations in
18 the past which we could not wait for the update to the
19 California MUTCD, so those were issued as traffic operation
20 policy directives under the signature of Robert Copp, our
21 division chief. And now I have incorporated those into the
22 manual because they have been official policies already on
23 the books.

24 The third thing that I've done with the California
25 MUTCD revisions, taking this as an opportunity to revise the

1 document, is that I have taken all the pending CTCDC action
2 items -- I wouldn't say all, but 31 items that had been
3 pending since probably the last six, seven years. And they
4 are shown on the agenda on pages beginning at page 2 of 55.

5 If you'd see under the informational item what we
6 have tried to do is list all those pending items that for
7 whatever reason were not either completed or not included in
8 our previous manuals. And all those items starting on page
9 2 of 55 under informational, through page 4 of 55 on the
10 agenda. And these are 31 items that now we have
11 incorporated them into the California MUTCD revision.

12 So, then the fourth category of things that I've
13 added into the manual is all the editorial errata, error,
14 formatting, those types of changes. Because those comments
15 that I've received and looked at, and I consider, being the
16 editor of the California MUTCD, when I look at it as long as
17 not a policy change; it's not changing any policy issues.
18 But it's only minor in nature. I've taken the liberty to
19 make those changes. And I do show them in red in the
20 revisions.

21 So, those are the four things that I've done in
22 the California MUTCD that is posted as revisions online.
23 And it was posted around July 1st of this year. And it has
24 been open for the public comments. And I've been receiving
25 comments.

1 Then further, Steve Pyburn, who is here, and he
2 and I have been looking at and working through all the
3 changes and the things that we have put in to make sure that
4 -- is on board when we are making these changes, so that it
5 doesn't become after the fact that -- manual and then we sit
6 down, like last time around, with -- what we found was we
7 did it the other way around, and then we came up with
8 several items that we had no authority to do in the state.
9 And that's the reason why we took them up as CTCDC items as
10 to undo those changes.

11 So this time around I worked with Steve. And so
12 far we have worked through part 1 through 5. We did not
13 have the opportunity to complete part 6 onwards. But I'll
14 let him speak for what our findings have been as to are we
15 on the same page or not.

16 So that is all the comments that I have, that I've
17 included into the California MUTCD revision.

18 Apart from that let me see if I can bring it up
19 here. I have received about -- I do have this as a handout,
20 just a list of all the changes. The list of all the
21 comments I've received.

22 So these are the comments I received. It's a
23 really big file. So, on this one, and here is the complete
24 like print out of those. There are 54 comments. Out of
25 these 54 comments, most of those comments have already been

1 addressed into the current revision that you see online,
2 because they were either commenting on editorial errata or
3 clarification, or formatting, and issues like that.

4 There were some comments that were made that are
5 policy changes. So as you know, when people are looking at
6 and reviewing and commenting, they are looking at the entire
7 document from scratch. So the comments that pertain to a
8 changing policy I have no authority to do.

9 So my question today to the Committee is going to
10 be is how do you want to proceed from there on out? What I
11 have done today, up to today is I've captured revision 2,
12 I've captured all the recommendations that the CTCDC has to
13 date. I've captured all the policy memos that we made
14 official.

15 However, in these comments half of these comments
16 are already captured into the revisions. The other half are
17 the ones that require a change in policy, which I cannot do.

18 So do we now, at this juncture, go ahead and make this
19 revision that I have posted online. I'll clean it up and
20 have better figures, and then I make it official?

21 Or, secondly, do we want to look at these comments
22 in a workshop setting and then go through some of these
23 changes. That's one way of doing it. But we will have to
24 accomplish all that task before January 22nd of the year.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Do you have a

1 summary of the major policy comments?

2 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. Actually I was getting the
3 comments all the way till the 22nd, so as you can see on
4 that list, so I did prepare like a pdf that I can send out.

5 So there are two ways of handling it. Either we
6 can do a workshop to handle some of those changes. Or, just
7 as our normal procedure is, any of those comments that I
8 received that were changes to the document, we can put them
9 as separate agenda items in future meetings and address them
10 accordingly that way.

11 So there are two ways of --

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Do you think any
13 of the policy comments, they have like a sense of urgency
14 or --

15 MR. BHULLAR: No, actually the way I'm looking at
16 it, some of them are -- what they're trying to ask us to do
17 is the NPA, the notice of proposed amendments, that the feds
18 have. Since they have it posted, even the feds have it as
19 proposed. They don't have it as official.

20 But some engineers are looking at it and because
21 it's shown by the feds in the figures and the tables almost
22 as final policy, so they're thinking it's already here. So
23 they want us to incorporate that. Which I don't think we
24 would want to do.

25 But some of the other comments were to reconsider

1 the share-a-lane markings and things of that nature. So
2 that is there.

3 And then apart from that there were some EDE
4 comments that we are addressing inhouse first. And I'm not
5 sure how we would deal with them.

6 But I'm not sure if a workshop is going to or not
7 going to help.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, this item
9 became too big. Let's go break it into pieces. Can we go
10 back to only the retroreflectivity part first?

11 MR. BHULLAR: Okay.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let's take it one
13 at a time.

14 MR. BHULLAR: All right.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, because
16 you're bringing like six big items here. Let's do one at a
17 time. Do you think it's better way to approach this,
18 because this is like, this is becoming too big. I cannot
19 let in one item.

20 What is your pleasure on the revisions to the --
21 revision number 2 for maintaining traffic sign
22 retroreflectivity? Yes, --

23 MR. BHULLAR: I mean I have a comment on that.
24 Actually that is already done. The CTCDC had already
25 reviewed and made a recommendation.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I remember that.

2 MR. BHULLAR: So, and the recommendation was to
3 incorporate the revision number 2, retroreflectivity, as is.

4 So already incorporated it --

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You send it to
6 all the public agencies and we did all that.

7 MR. BHULLAR: Yes, that's already done.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There's no need
9 to --

10 MR. BHULLAR: So, here I'm --

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, okay, --

12 MR. BHULLAR: -- just making it official by
13 putting it into the --

14 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Can I make one
15 comment? If the Committee Member has reviewed the item, 31
16 item, which we include in the California MUTCD, you're
17 welcome to give the comment. That's all related to this
18 item.

19 Other comment with Johnny -- yeah.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Other, yeah,
21 let's completely separate them. Let's not talk about these
22 comments and all that. They're all different. Let's focus
23 on the agenda here.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Just this one item,
25 because I have an issue on one of the miscellaneous items

1 that --

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So let's
3 go to the miscellaneous.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Did you want to handle,
5 could be first?

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, that one
7 we've already even sent it to the local agencies. Let's go
8 to the miscellaneous.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: What is the
10 miscellaneous? All we have is page 18 on our agenda.

11 MR. BHULLAR: Well, page 18, I believe, what
12 probably Jeff is talking about, is on page 18, if you look
13 at the second bullet there, pending items for Caltrans
14 actions. That actually includes all the items so we can
15 talk about starting on page 2, all the items, 31 items.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, go back to
17 page 2 where it says information.

18 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Again, what I want to
19 say, all those items Committee has recommended before.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah.

21 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: And we are just
22 including. If you have comment on the parts that were
23 included, say any --

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, this is not
25 -- let me clarify. This is not a new item. This is a

1 housekeeping item, a house-clearing item. We have already
2 made recommendations on all of these, how many items there,
3 20 items, maybe more.

4 MR. BHULLAR: Thirty-one.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: How many?

6 MR. BHULLAR: Thirty-one.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thirty-one.

8 There are 31 items. We have already discussed these over
9 the last three, four, five years, whatever. All that
10 Caltrans is doing now is just finalizing it, putting it in
11 the manual. That's all we are doing.

12 Now, there's nothing wrong with going back and
13 revisiting our own previous recommendations, as long as we
14 don't have a 180-degree change of direction.

15 So, with that, let's go with Jeff.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay. And I'm
17 relatively new here, so I'm not sure what the process is.
18 But I did see this as a public hearing, and it seemed like
19 the last opportunity to comment on this pending item, 08-8.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: 08-8, I will --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Which has to do with
22 the bicycle and motorcycle detection, and the new
23 requirements for minimum green times at traffic signals.

24 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: This is on page 6.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, that one,

1 the policy directive has been signed and has been issued.
2 If you want to bring it back to change -- I have received
3 half a dozen very angry emails and phone calls on that one.

4 My reply to them was where were you the last two
5 and a half years.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, but I mean that's
7 one of the things I wanted to bring out, is that I believe,
8 number one, for example, that chart on 4D-62 the Committee
9 didn't even see. We simply recommended that Caltrans
10 prepare a chart.

11 And I believe most engineers, that time signals
12 operate signals time arterial corridors have no idea that
13 this is coming. And I don't know of another forum to put
14 this into the record. Because I finally got the
15 opportunity, after hearing this, to go to an actual
16 intersection, apply the rules, and quantify the impact.

17 I mean so I went to one of my intersections and,
18 you know, on this particular street because it's two
19 crossing arterials, this did add 4 seconds of minimum green
20 time on my through movement, which wasn't too bad. But when
21 you're scraping for every second, when you're working with
22 FETSIM projects, millions of dollars of state money,
23 millions of dollars of federal money, to try to reduce
24 automotive emissions, reduce fuel consumption, you know,
25 improve the delivery of people, goods and services, every

1 second counts.

2 Especially when you're trying to minimize cycle
3 lengths for those engineers that work on this.

4 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Which table is that?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: 4D-62.

6 MR. BHULLAR: It's not in the --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And the language that
8 goes with this. So the problem was, for example, when you
9 look at this chart, and in fact if you go below the chart,
10 when I looked at the southbound left turn I had to increase
11 the minimum green time by 10 seconds.

12 So this mean, since my video detection or my loops
13 can't tell the difference between a car, a motorcycle or a
14 bicycle. Every time I have a single car in the southbound
15 left turn lane, I have to give it 20 seconds of time, when
16 you add up the green time, the yellow time and the all-red.
17 Twenty seconds for one car.

18 Which means for everybody else at the
19 intersections, we talk about the additional green time, but
20 what we're not talking about is every time we increase the
21 green time we're increasing the red time for somebody else.

22 And when you add up 4 seconds for northbound
23 through, 10 seconds for the southbound left, 4 seconds for
24 the eastbound through, 10 seconds for the westbound left,
25 because these are two big crossing arterials, there's 28 new

1 seconds of lost red time. Nobody's using it.

2 The motorist sitting at the signal will be sitting
3 on a red and nobody's going through the intersection. This
4 frustrates drivers. It makes it look like the signal's not
5 working. There's nothing more dangerous than a frustrated
6 driver.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yes, Mr. Knowles,
8 I completely and fully agree with all that you said. The
9 policy directive on that has been issued. If you want, we
10 can ask Caltrans to bring it back. We can revisit the whole
11 issue of the timing and get the bicycle advisory committee
12 involved again and all that.

13 What I'm saying is that these 31 items, on that
14 single one, let's -- if you want to bring it back, we can
15 always ask to bring it back.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, especially
17 because I don't think they've looked at the environmental
18 impacts of that. There's nothing in the MUTCD that will
19 have as --

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I -- I --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- deleterious effect
22 on the environment as this clause.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And your comments
24 have been very polite and professional. The comments that I
25 heard over the phone, I cannot repeat here.

1 But my point to the people, and I was talking with
2 Rock Miller on the phone -- on the plane, we were sharing a
3 plane yesterday -- and I told him, I said, where were all
4 these people for the last two years that two committees were
5 discussing all these issues. The bicycle advisory committee
6 and -- but having all said that, that is a very big, huge
7 issue.

8 Let's focus on the 31. If you don't feel
9 comfortable with that single item, whatever we do today
10 really doesn't matter because the policy directive has
11 already been signed by Mr. Copp, has already been issued.

12 If you want to revisit and advise Caltrans,
13 recommend to Caltrans another set of policies, we can always
14 put it on a future agenda.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: You know, I just want
16 to say, I hear what you're saying, but there was nothing in
17 the legislation that I can see, although it talked about
18 motorcycle and bicycle detection, that would have warned any
19 traffic engineers that we were going to completely redesign
20 minimum green time and take away all options to provide
21 video detection in the intersection, to clear a slow
22 vehicle.

23 I mean this simply says this shall be the minimum
24 green time, which means it can be longer.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But that gives us no
2 options whatsoever. And it uses green as a clearance
3 interval, which is completely -- doesn't match the
4 professional standards. And the legislature specifically
5 said we need to engineer this per existing professional
6 standards. We never use green --

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And I agree with
8 you. Let me ask Mr. Henley to correct me if I'm wrong, but
9 policy directive on that has been signed by Mr. Copp. It's
10 already been issued, right?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yes, it has.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So it has already
13 been issued. So it is part of the manual as we speak.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: No, well, yes, it is as
15 we speak. But the point is it's not part of what we're
16 talking about right now, which is 9-17, which talks about
17 the 31 items.

18 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Even if it's not, yet,
19 it's going to be included, and there was California MUTCD --

20 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yeah, I think let's
21 don't make the distinction what Jeff is talking about, that
22 even though we had only those 31 items, but this came in
23 very late. So if you can consider it as one of those items,
24 but since the -- has been issued, the right way to address
25 probably Jeff's concerns would be to put that on the agenda

1 to make a change to an existing policy.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I brought it up now
3 because it was recommended. If I was going to bring it up,
4 9-17 was when to bring it up.

5 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: How it's going to
6 work, Jeff, is you need to send your proposal and I will
7 agendize that item for the next meeting. But you need to
8 initiate.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, let's move
10 on. Okay, so that item, if Mr. Knowles is interested, he's
11 going to make a request like any other member of the
12 Committee, he can always put items on the agenda and we'll
13 discuss it next meeting.

14 For now let's go back to the 31 items that we have
15 on our plate. Any comments on those, because this is a
16 public hearing, I need to open it up to the public, also.

17 Let's start from here. Mr. Babico.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I don't know about these
19 31 items, where are they?

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It's on page 2.
21 If you go on page 2, under 9, information item.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I'm trying to find them.
23 I pass; I don't have comments at this time.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Mr.
25 Presleigh?

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: No comments.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Fisher?

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I don't even
4 think comments are appropriate because we --

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Because they've
6 already made their --

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: -- gone
8 through a public process and this is an informational item.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Henley.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: My only comment was, you
11 know, we took the CTCDC action and put it into the manual.
12 And I hope we captured what you guys wanted in the manual.
13 So that's the reason, you know, we want to hear from the
14 public really.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Perfect. Chief.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: No comments.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Ms. Wong?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: No comments.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Knowles, I
20 know of your comment about the bicycle. And by all means,
21 put it back on the agenda; bring it back.

22 Okay, let's open to the public. Members of the
23 public who wish to speak on this item. Mr. Shanteau.

24 DR. SHANTEAU: Bob Shanteau, California
25 Association of Bicycling Organizations. I just wanted to

1 confirm that the top D09-06 bicycle and motorcycle detection
2 is part of this item, is that correct?

3 MR. BHULLAR: Yes. It's already included in the
4 revision and that's what I show up there.

5 DR. SHANTEAU: Yeah, that's --

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, thanks for
7 clarification.

8 MR. BHULLAR: So the revision that's supposed to
9 go online includes that.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's good
11 enough, Mr. Bhullar. Any other members of the public?
12 Seeing none, I close the public hearing. Bringing it back
13 on item 09-17. Understanding you can bring back any item
14 you want at a later date.

15 Do I have a motion?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yes, I have a motion to
17 approve it.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There's a motion.
19 Is there a second?

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Second.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There's a motion
22 and second. Any discussion?

23 Seeing none, all those in favor say aye.

24 (Ayes.)

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Opposition?

1 MR. SPEAKER: No.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There is one
3 negative vote. There is one no. Any abstention? Passes
4 seven to one.

5 Okay, 09-19, proposal to amend California MUTCD
6 section 1A.10.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: This has to do with
8 experimentation. And the fact that, I guess the way the
9 MUTCD now says basically it's got some language in there
10 that says the FHWA shall approve experimentation. And
11 there's no word about CTCDC.

12 So it's a change in the -- change to the section
13 1A.10, to add that the CTC get an upfront look at these
14 experiments so that we can, you know, pose our questions
15 which we're eventually going to ask anyway.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So basically the
17 change is only on page 22 of 55, and that's that red line
18 over there?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yes.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, it's as
21 simple as single sentence addition to the manual. Pretty
22 much it's right on page 22 of 55. And says the agency shall
23 request and receive the Devices Committee's and blah, blah.

24 Okay, any questions from Caltrans?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Can I make a motion?

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I have to open it
2 to public. It's public item. Is there any questions --
3 John, is that your --

4 MR. SPEAKER: No.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No. Okay, if you
6 guys don't have any questions, I'm going to open it to the
7 public. Any members of the public who wishes to address the
8 Committee on this item?

9 Seeing none, close the public hearing. And now,
10 Mr. Babico, you can make your motion.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah, I move to pass
12 this item, approve this item.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There's a motion
14 to approve the change as recommended by Caltrans Staff.
15 Second?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Second.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There is a second
18 over there, Mr. Knowles. And, discussion?

19 Seeing none, all those in favor?

20 (Ayes.)

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any no? No. No
22 abstention. Motion passes unanimously.

23 I'm going fast to make up time for what we lost of
24 07-17.

25 DR. SHANTEAU: Mr. Bahadori?

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yes.

2 DR. SHANTEAU: When does that action take effect?

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: When Caltran issue the
4 -- it will be in action taken by the Committee today. It
5 will be in the California MUTCD.

6 DR. SHANTEAU: Thank you.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thanks for
8 clarification, Mr. Singh.

9 09-20, last item on our public hearing; actually
10 we have added one. Proposed amendment to California MUTCD
11 introduction. Mr. Henley.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Okay, this is a
13 situation where, believe it or not, Caltrans and the CT logo
14 are registered service marks. And so we have to, you know,
15 put a little "r" behind each one, whenever we use the word
16 Caltrans on a sign, or the CT logo, which probably not too
17 many cities and counties will be doing.

18 But we have to now put that "r". Yeah, so, Mr.
19 Howe's going to quickly go over that. Mr. Howe.

20 MR. HOWE: Hello. My name is Don Howe; I work as
21 the science chief at Caltrans Headquarters. And this is a
22 housekeeping item, more than anything.

23 We have an internal deputy directive that was
24 signed by Randy Iwasaki, who is now our director, on
25 February 26, 2008. And it basically sets forth the

1 requirement that our CT, they call it a symbol, and then
2 underneath it says Caltrans, or it can be used in that mode
3 as you see on -- if you look on page 29 of 55.

4 There are four different combinations in which CT
5 and Caltrans, the symbol and the logo type, may be
6 displayed. And you can see that in all of them, the
7 registered service mark goes next to the CT, as well as the
8 Caltrans logo type.

9 And if you notice there, no example, it just shows
10 Caltrans logo type all by itself. Usually it's accompanied
11 by the CT or the CT stands alone.

12 In the introduction of the California MUTCD or in
13 the federal MUTCD we have standard language regarding
14 copyright for the interstate shield. And any other items
15 owned by the FHWA. To my knowledge the interstate shield is
16 the only copyrighted image that FHWA does make mention.

17 So I included the Caltrans symbol and logo type as
18 our part of what's covered by a service mark copyright.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Any
20 questions for Mr. Howe? Seeing none, I open it to public.
21 Any member of the public who wish to address the Committee
22 on this item? Seeing none, --

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I have a question and
24 I've forgotten.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, okay, let's

1 bring it back to the Committee. Mr. Babico.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah, I know that this
3 is only to be used by Caltrans. Can any local agency use
4 that by changing that logo and put their logo?

5 MR. HOWE: In answer to your question, we do
6 display local agency artwork. MUTCD is publishing their
7 notice for proposed amendment that calls institutional or
8 governmental artwork as pictographs.

9 So I'll address this under that terminology as
10 pictographs. And they do show up on our 2006 bond funding
11 sites, together with the Caltrans symbol and logo type.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: What I'm saying is that
13 instead of CT, Caltrans, I put County of San Bernardino. Is
14 that possible?

15 MR. HOWE: On a sign?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah.

17 MR. HOWE: Yes, we do have the "your tax dollars
18 at work sign" which is shown on one of our standard plans.
19 And that does allow for --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: What I'm trying to say,
21 shouldn't this item reflect flexibility for local agency to
22 be used by local agency? That's my point.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Are you asking if
24 local agencies can use Caltrans logo for their onsite --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, no, I'm saying the

1 sign, change the logo.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Of course you
3 can.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: It doesn't say.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So you're
6 specifically talking about this "slow for the cone zone" or
7 any sign?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, this sign is
9 before us for discussion.

10 MR. HOWE: It's not signed, no.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It's not signed.
12 It's only Caltrans logo being added by that "r" for
13 registered trademark.

14 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: -- that statement.
15 It's not a sign. The sign is already approved, so you can
16 use the sign --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Without CT?

18 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yeah, you can -- we
19 aren't talking about sign over here -- could you explain,
20 Don? We are talking about sign, "slow for the cone zone."

21 MR. HOWE: This is just an example sign. And one
22 of the observations I made was that the "r" is missing.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: But in the California
24 MUTCD this sign is there available for local agency to use
25 it.

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Yes.

2 MR. HOWE: Yes.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay. You've answered
4 my question.

5 MR. HOWE: If I understand your question
6 correctly, can that CT, Caltrans symbol and logo type be
7 removed and have County of San Bernardino?

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah.

9 MR. HOWE: I'm not that familiar with this
10 particular sign to address that. I believe that this is a
11 commercial artwork that was registered for "slow for the
12 cone zone" campaign that included the Caltrans symbol and
13 logo type.

14 I don't believe our policy allows for replacement
15 of that.

16 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: I'm sorry, if the sign
17 is --

18 MR. BHULLAR: The only change we are trying to
19 make here is to this language that is in the introduction
20 part of the national MUTCD, which says that any traffic
21 control device, design or application provision contained in
22 this manual shall be considered to be in the public domain.
23 Traffic control devices contained in this manual shall not
24 be protected by a patent, trademark or copyright, except for
25 the interstate shield. And any other items owned by a --

1 So that's what the feds have restricted everyone.

2 And what we are trying to do is expand that to include
3 Caltrans. That's the only change we are making.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, yeah, let's
5 move --

6 MR. BHULLAR: The slow for the cone zone sign is
7 just --

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- let's, let's
9 go -- it's got nothing to do with the sign. This sign, any
10 other art work of any other agency, nothing. Only we are
11 adding a little circle, we've got letter "r" in it next to
12 Caltrans logo. That's all this item is about. That's all
13 this is about.

14 Does anyone have any motion?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah, I move to approve
16 it.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, any second?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Second.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There's a motion
20 and a second by Ms. Wong. Any discussion? Seeing none, the
21 motion passes.

22 We're not to the last item one the --

23 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Did you ask for a
24 vote?

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: What's that?

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Did you ask for a
2 vote?

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I did --

4 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: You didn't ask for the
5 vote.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Was there a vote
7 on the last motion?

8 SPEAKERS: Aye.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, aye. No
10 opposition.

11 MR. HOWE: Thank you.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: By the way, you
13 could have just added that circle, Don. You didn't need to
14 bring it here. Okay, thank you.

15 Proposal to add, this is item 09-23, proposal to
16 add no-parking signs during school days to California MUTCD,
17 section 2B39. Mr. Henley.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: That's not mine.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Babico.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Which page are you?

21 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: It's on the amended
22 agenda.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: This is the one
25 that Mr. Fisher actually had some new comments that he

1 shared with us, right?

2 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Yes, indeed.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Indeed. And I'm
4 sure he's going to repeat them again.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Right. Okay, --

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Just a second,
7 Mr. Babico. Before you start, --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- this is an
10 added item, so some of you, if you have the old agenda, you
11 may not have it. But I have it.

12 Okay, so that you know, we're going to take a
13 short break after this one. Go ahead.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay. A question to us
15 on several occasions that we have where the school is on one
16 side and the residential homes are on the other side. And
17 the school is providing parking areas. And they would like
18 the students and the parents all to park within inside the
19 boundary of the school.

20 However, being on the opposite side of the school
21 in residential, we would like to prohibit parking during
22 school hours only. And we do not have a blanket every day,
23 but we would like to specifically use it for the school days
24 only. Knowing that some schools do not operate during
25 summer, so at least you would not implement that restriction

1 for the parking, which is essential for the residents.

2 Actually I went through all the sign; I didn't see
3 the signs which specifically restrict those during school
4 hours. I mean there is the R30 and R30(CA), R31(CA),
5 R32(BCA). All they talk about between Monday through
6 Friday. The only thing I'm changing is that phrase to have
7 the option to have it school days, the restriction, and
8 during the school days and school hours, from the morning
9 hours and afternoon hours. That's it.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.

11 So there is a proposal to introduce a new sign to
12 California -- actually four new signs to California MUTCD.

13 Members? Mr. Fisher, I know you have some
14 thoughts.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Yes, and I'm
16 going to make some general comments because I think maybe
17 the way we wrote section 2B-39 maybe doesn't come across as
18 clear as it might, given the number of questions that I've
19 seen emerge out of it.

20 But the first support statement says that signs
21 governing the parking, stopping and standing of vehicles
22 cover a wide variety of regulations, and only general
23 guidance can be provided here.

24 In other words, we show 72 signs illustrated in
25 the figures. There are a thousand combinations. You could

1 have no stopping 6:00 to 10:00 instead of 7:00 to 9:00. You
2 could have no parking. You could have a tow-away message.
3 You could have the tow-away symbol. You could have the no
4 parking word message with no in the upper left. And you can
5 have the no parking shown with a big P with a circle and
6 slash through it.

7 I think what the 72 signs illustrate are the
8 general formats to be used, knowing that they're not going
9 to cover every specific situation that is out there.

10 But I think if you wanted to have no parking for
11 hours that are not shown in figure 2B16, I think you could
12 use one of the formats that's prescribed here for the no
13 parking. You could either use the big P with the circle and
14 slash, or you could use the no with a red background with
15 parking below it.

16 We have an example for no parking 10:00 to 12:00
17 Wednesday for street sweeping. You could make a slight
18 adjustment in the format and say no parking 9:00 to 3:00 on
19 school days. And, you know, it would adhere what the limit
20 that's already been prescribed.

21 So I think the way the manual is, it already gives
22 you the option to show different days of the week.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Which one shows no
24 school days?

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: You can add

1 it. I mean --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Oh, okay. You can add
3 it, okay.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: The sign
5 doesn't show that you can have street sweeping from 8:00 to
6 10:00. I mean, it doesn't show every hour.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, I understand that.
8 But this one is we are trying to minimize the impact of
9 taking away parking.

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Right.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: If it says -- if the
12 purpose is for the school, and if the school is not in
13 session, I don't want to restrict parking.

14 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: No, I --
15 absolutely. We --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: So are you saying that
17 these Monday to Friday is exchangeable to school days?

18 MR. SPEAKER: Or street sweeping is exchangeable
19 for school days.

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Right, I --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah, we need to
22 identify that.

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Well, and
24 maybe, you know, where we have general guidance, only
25 general guidance is provided here. Well, maybe that needs

1 to be emphasized.

2 But my interpretation is that we already have the
3 ability to change the hours and the days that aren't
4 explicitly shown here.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, that's what
6 the -- and that's the email that I got from Mr. Fisher,
7 also. On this one, Mr. Babico, I know it's your local issue
8 and you're going to make a decision, but if you install
9 these let me know where you install them. Because I want to
10 come park and get a ticket and fight it.

11 (Laughter.)

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Because the
13 driving public is not expected to know when school days are.
14 You have to be specific to the days of the week. That's
15 why we are saying Monday through Friday, or weekends.

16 And I understand that it's a local issue, and the
17 residents in the area may know when the school days are.
18 But the driving public who's visiting that neighborhood, how
19 is he or she expected to know what the school days are?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: The homeowner will tell
21 that guy.

22 (Laughter.)

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So I understand
24 what Mr. Fisher is saying. And probably, and Mr. Bhullar is
25 the resident expert on this, and he's going to clarify.

1 Probably the manual gives you the flexibility to put the
2 school days, anyway, if you want.

3 But I, for one, would advise against it. But it's
4 your call because that's probably going to be fought because
5 you cannot expect people to know when the school days are.
6 They don't know when schools are in session.

7 Mr. Presleigh.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: I'm just wondering
9 have you looked at maybe a date, school days with a date on
10 it, you know, from here to there, as an addition to the
11 signs. I mean you could get specific on this.

12 I would concur with some of the other members here
13 that who knows when the school days. They could be -- so I
14 would encourage you to maybe look at a date or something.
15 Or you could bag the signs during the off season when the
16 school's not in session. We've done that with our Live Oak
17 parking program. Or remove the signs completely.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Anyways, we have
19 the comments. And then let's go to this side of the table.

20 Mr. Henley?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah, my first reaction
22 was exactly that. You know, schools nowadays seem like
23 there are some of them year-round schools and some are, you
24 know, closed during the summer. And so it's really
25 difficult.

1 But I'd also agree with John, though, that the
2 idea was to make it as flexible as possible. And there,
3 again, if you want to go fight your ticket, go ahead and
4 spend your afternoons doing that.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Fighting those
6 tickets, that's my --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: So, anyway, that's where
8 I'm coming from.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Chief?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Yeah, I think the
11 wording in the manual the way it is allows for them to put
12 whatever verbiage they want to on it. So, I don't see that
13 we need to address that.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Ms. Wong?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: I agree.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Knowles?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I mean in the
18 practice I guess the language wasn't clear enough to us
19 because we always sweated over your adding standing with
20 parking. Because around our schools if the driver's still
21 in the vehicle the courts were throwing out the ticket
22 because they're not parked, they're standing.

23 And there wasn't an official sign. And so we felt
24 like we were bending the rules by adding the word, but it
25 was more important for it to stand up in court than to not

1 be able to cite.

2 And I have the same concern about school days.
3 But really we can't put dates because there's spring break;
4 there's Christmas break; there's holidays. You know,
5 there's so many different days when school's not in session,
6 that I agree. I hear what you're saying, and that is a
7 problem. And it's really up to the police department to
8 pick what days they're going to be out there enforcing. In
9 the real world they're not out on every street every day
10 every hour doing enforcement.

11 But I do think the language in the manual needs to
12 be a little bit more clear. If, indeed, it is okay to
13 substitute something like school days only for the street
14 sweeping message in the past, I don't think that that was
15 clear.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Good. Any other
17 comments before I open to public? Okay. Any members of the
18 public who wish to address the Committee on this issue? Mr.
19 Bhullar, you're not public, you're a staff.

20 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. A
21 couple of things I want to add here. First of all, I do
22 differ with John on this in that all these signs that we
23 have for parking, as you can see the ones even in red that
24 we have added, they are based upon the vehicle codes or
25 streets and highway code. So there is a basis for what

1 reason why we created those. And that's the reason why we
2 put that language on those signs.

3 So, coming up with and trying to say the existing
4 signs, and you can change it to school days, if there is no
5 vehicle code and we don't show it in the manual, you cannot
6 do that. Because the vehicle code, the 21400 and 21401 say
7 that only signs shown in the manual are the ones you can
8 use.

9 And unless we show all these different iterations
10 or different like alternative messages in the sign specs for
11 the signs, then you can do it. Otherwise, you can't.

12 Secondly, as soon as you put a regulatory sign, if
13 it's in the manual, what Jacob's request is, if we agree
14 with and want to do these signs, we really do not need a
15 vehicle code. But these specific sign with this specific
16 message need to go into the California MUTCD, because there
17 is a one vehicle code that's a catch-all, meaning that if
18 any sign that is identified of a regulatory nature in this
19 manual, then it does give you that blessing.

20 So my take on this is, as per Jacob's request,
21 either we approve these signs for incorporation into the
22 manual. Otherwise the current language does not allow you
23 the latitude of just changing it to school days and --

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, on that one
25 I have a little different take. Because the California

1 vehicle code in certain sections says exactly why the
2 parking should be restricted. But pretty much parking is a
3 local issue. It's not a state issue. So states can
4 regulate and restrict parking for whatever reason, just for
5 the heck of it. They don't want anybody to park on any
6 street, the state does not preempt them, they can do that.

7 So, I don't think that they need to have a
8 California vehicle code section to add school days. But I
9 disagree with that on other matters, but not on vehicle
10 code.

11 MR. BHULLAR: But you do need a sign.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah. Mr.
13 Fisher.

14 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Well, I'm not
15 sure if I agree or disagree with either of you, but I think
16 the same vehicle code section that allows local
17 jurisdictions by resolution or ordinance may restrict
18 parking on days and hours that they so designate. That
19 would be the same section that would apply to school days.

20 And I recognize Mr. Bahadori's concern with
21 designating school days. But we do have other signs here
22 that say no parking 7:00 to 9:00, or something like that.
23 And that designates hours, just like school days would
24 designate a period.

25 So I think it would be the same vehicle code

1 section. But I totally agree with you that you can only
2 implement restrictions that the vehicle code allows you to
3 implement by ordinance or resolution.

4 But I think there is a vehicle code section that
5 would allow you to have no parking during specific hours and
6 days of the week, which might include school days.

7 MR. BHULLAR: Well, in that case I do agree.
8 John, in that case, maybe what we should do is look at an
9 existing sign where this message will fit and include that
10 in our policy as an alternate message. And we can show it
11 in the sign spec that on that sign spec you can use this
12 school days as an alternate message to the date or the
13 times. So let's be a little bit --

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let me ask you
15 one thing, Mr. Bhullar. If I'm City X and I have a street,
16 and I just want to restrict parking just for the heck of it.
17 Does the California vehicle code allow that or not?

18 MR. BHULLAR: I have no expertise in that, so I
19 couldn't answer that.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah. Chief?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Well, you have a county
22 ordinance or --

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: -- a city code that
25 would --

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, as long as
2 you pass a local ordinance or resolution depending, you can
3 do it. So that's not really -- I really don't think it's
4 going to stop them from doing it.

5 My concern is because school days is a vague term,
6 it's going to confuse motorists.

7 Okay, I close the public hearing. I brought it
8 back. So, what's your pleasure, colleagues?

9 MR. PYBURN: I have a comment.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yes, sir, you are
11 staff, too. We treated Matt nice. We are going to extend
12 the same treatment to you.

13 MR. PYBURN: The same treatment or same courtesy?

14 (Laughter.)

15 MR. PYBURN: Steve Pyburn of Federal Highways --

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: We were not
17 courteous to Matt, believe me.

18 MR. PYBURN: Like you said, there's thousands or
19 hundreds of variations of what a parking sign can say, from
20 time, location, purpose, et cetera. I remember at the
21 Giants games in San Francisco there was a schedule of games
22 when you couldn't park in certain places around the
23 ballpark. And it struck me as really confusing.

24 I would suggest, and would like to see both the
25 national and the state manual go to more, with regard to

1 parking signs, general guidance. As in size, shape, color,
2 symbols and specific requirements like no parking.

3 But then allow flexibility for local agencies to
4 restrict parking for special purposes, whether it's street
5 cleaning, school zones or because for whatever other reason
6 they want.

7 All the local agency more flexibility. Not by
8 saying this is a message you can have in these places, but
9 this is generally what the sign has to say. And look like
10 other things are up to local discretion.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you. Very
12 good.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I'm totally in
14 agreement.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, Mr. Babico,
16 this is your item. What do you say after all the discussion
17 that occurred?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, if we have some
19 flexibility for having that, for the specific use, that
20 wording would be exchangeable from the R30 we have, it says
21 from Monday to Friday. If that is exchangeable to just say
22 school days only, that's fine. There's no need to designate
23 new signs. Because it already specifies the hours for the
24 R30, R31 CA sign, and R32 BCA.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So is that the

1 understanding of the Committee and Caltrans Staff that the
2 words are exchangeable?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I mean and that would
4 be my recommendation, is that if that's where we're going
5 then instead of this proposal we come back with a language
6 change. Because I don't think that's been understood by
7 local agencies that we had that flexibility.

8 There's something -- we need to go back and review
9 the language and see where some think we have the
10 flexibility and where we think we don't. Because I don't
11 think that's clear. And I think neither did you or else you
12 wouldn't have brought this forward.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Well, but I
14 would offer that again 2B-39 says -- I've kind of misplaced
15 it here, but it says that -- hold on a second -- signs
16 governing the parking, stopping and standing of vehicles
17 cover a wide variety of regulations, and only general
18 guidance can be provided here.

19 We do illustrate the no parking symbol and the no
20 parking message. We do indicate hours, we do indicate days.
21 We also have the R30B sign that even has the word school
22 days on it.

23 So I would say it's already there. But I would
24 agree with you that it's not widely understood.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Bhullar, have

1 you been receiving any questions related to something like
2 this from locals?

3 MR. BHULLAR: Not yet.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: This is like, so
5 it's your understanding that the words can be changed the
6 same way we saying Monday through Friday, we can say school
7 days?

8 MR. BHULLAR: Well, school days being different,
9 like Jeff is pointing out, because it's not something's
10 clear
11 if --

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Well, say street
13 sweeping days, for example. Some say street sweeping there,
14 but for street sweeping we specifically give the date and
15 the time.

16 MR. BHULLAR: Yes.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Mr. Chairman.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yes, sir.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Just to remind John,
21 remember that there is a language for the arrows, for the no
22 parking left, right, double arrows. And that is
23 exchangeable.

24 You remember one time we discussed that? If there
25 is such a language for the arrows, why can't we have the

1 language for the specific use?

2 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I don't
3 understand.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: On certain signs of
6 those 39 you mentioned, there are some signs with arrows
7 indicating from here to there; or sometimes it had arrows at
8 the bottom of the sign for the no parking.

9 When I raised that question you said there is a
10 language in that section 2B39 that says these arrows are
11 exchangeable. It shows double arrow, but you can use single
12 arrow.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Right, the --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Can't we have the same
15 thing for the specific use? To be flexible.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Again, I think
17 the signs are for illustrative purposes only.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Right.

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Every sign you
20 designate that may be illustrative with the double arrow --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Right.

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: -- there's
23 language in the text that said it can be shown with a single
24 arrow if that's the applicable zone.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Why can't we do the same

1 thing, instead of the Monday through Friday, say school days
2 only.

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I would argue
4 that the language here in the variety of formats presented
5 give you those options.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, we need to
7 move on. So, Mr. Babico, do you want to bring this back
8 with specific language, or do you think we have heard enough
9 that you think you have the authority to do this?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I don't know. Show me.
11 I mean if I can use it, I don't need to bring it.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I, for one, I
13 think that this sign that you're going to put up a decent
14 traffic judge is going to dismiss it, he's going to throw it
15 out. Regardless, whether you have the authority to do it or
16 not. Because you cannot possibly expect an average driver
17 to know what school days are in each neighborhood.

18 Somebody just mentioned, the schools they have
19 spring recess, they have Christmas recess. Some schools are
20 year-round; some schools are closing in the middle of June.
21 Some of those in early July; some opening in August; some
22 opening in September.

23 A driver cannot be expected to know what the
24 school days are. It's entrapment in my mind, that you're
25 entrapping people by giving them a ticket where they're

1 expected to know things that they cannot possibly know.

2 So, regardless of whether you have the authority
3 under the manual to do it or not, I don't know we need to
4 add, I don't think it's a good idea. But it's your local
5 political issue. I don't want to get in the middle of that.

6 But if you post it I'll come and I'll fight you.

7 With that, do you -- what is the pleasure of the
8 Committee? Do you want this to come back as an addition to
9 the manual? Or you think they can go ahead and do it?

10 Or do you even support adding something like this
11 to the manual?

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: My concern is we use
13 the manual quite a bit to fight off the -- I don't want to
14 say that necessarily on the record, but we try to stick to
15 the manual and use it as the reason why we can put in
16 certain nonstandard signs when we're requested by particular
17 individuals. You know, like when I get a request for a
18 tricky crossing sign, because of the wild turkeys in
19 Pleasanton.

20 And so as long as there's specific language about
21 no parking signs, no stopping signs, it provides us
22 flexibility that we don't have with other types of signs
23 where we can just substitute a different animal for the
24 deer, or the pedestrian.

25 I want to make sure that there's really clear

1 language that there really is flexibility with the parking
2 signs that doesn't exist with all the other types of signs
3 in the manual. Because we use those signs to try to limit
4 the different types of signs that go out on the street.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I'll follow up on
6 that one. So if you think that we want to standardize and
7 we don't want all these variety of signs out there, if there
8 is support in the Committee for the proposed signs by Mr.
9 Babico to make it to the manual, then do you want this to
10 come back with a specific language and standard sign design?

11 Do you think to even support the idea of adding these signs
12 to the manual?

13 Mr. Fisher.

14 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I would offer,
15 and I'm not going to make this a motion yet, because I want
16 to hear what the others thing, but I would offer that --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I'll second it.

18 (Laughter.)

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Maybe the best
20 thing to do, Jacob, would be for us to decide that this
21 matter can be withdrawn and that jurisdictions have the
22 flexibility pursuant to an enabling section of the vehicle
23 code, to post parking restriction signs. Conclude that.

24 And then determine that when we update the
25 California MUTCD, right after the national manual is

1 updated, when we respond to that, that we commit to beefing
2 up the language to indicate that there is flexibility on
3 days and hours pursuant to a section of the vehicle code. I
4 think that would be the best way to handle it.

5 I don't think we need to belabor it too much now.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So you think it's
7 okay to post a no parking sign in front of city hall and say
8 no parking during city council days?

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Well, that's
10 not what I said.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, but what I'm
12 saying if you give the flexibility and the language remains
13 vague, my question about the whole thing is that all the
14 signs that we have now, they have very specific days of the
15 week and times that any average citizen knows when he or she
16 cannot park there.

17 If you start introducing generic terms, such as
18 school days, or city council days, how are people expected
19 to know when they cannot park there?

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: And that's why
21 I suggested that the County of San Bernardino may wish to
22 withdraw this request, and just get a general statement that
23 local agencies have the flexibility to post restricted
24 parking during times and days so designated. And let the
25 County of San Bernardino decide if this would be

1 enforceable.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, we need to
3 move on. It's almost 11:00.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Are you saying that it
5 is okay to post these signs for school days only?

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I think that
7 several have brought up a number of concerns that how would
8 the public know which is a school day, especially if you're
9 coming to visit a friend. And you're not sure whether you
10 can park there or not. You're not familiar with the area.

11 So I would think that in looking at how much you
12 can exercise your flexibility, you'd want to take that into
13 account.

14 But I think if you bring it to the Committee to
15 say is it okay to do this, then we're going to get into an
16 extended discussion as to how does someone know when a
17 school day is.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. This is
19 your item. You have to decide how you think is best for you
20 to dispose of it. Do you want to carry, come back? Do you
21 want to withdraw? Mr. Bhullar.

22 MR. BHULLAR: Just one comment. We do have
23 created these signs, school days, five-minute limit. These
24 are the new signs we have added as part of the parking,
25 subcommittee parking signs. So the precedents is already

1 there.

2 MR. SPEAKER: The precedent is proposed.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah, but this is
4 parking.

5 MR. BHULLAR: -- loading versus parking, yeah.
6 The precedent is there; that's all I'm pointing out. These
7 are new signs.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: So what do you say for
9 that?

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Expanding the
11 government abuse of citizens, okay. Go ahead. So what do
12 you want, Mr. Babico? If you want the Committee to consider
13 for adding to the manual, it's not ready; it has to come
14 back with a specific language and sign design and all that.
15 And we're welcome to bring it back next time, see if you
16 get support to add it to the manual.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, if we decide to
18 change the language, I don't need to have a new sign,
19 because I'm changing only the language. Instead of Monday
20 to Friday, I can say school days only. Same sign.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, but we
22 heard members of the Committee saying that that's not their
23 feeling. Ms. Wong.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: If that's the case then
25 why can't a street sweeping sign be used instead of

1 introducing a new sign for school days?

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, but on the
3 street sweeping sign you always have a day and a time. It
4 just don't say no parking, street sweeping day. Because the
5 driver doesn't know when the street sweeping day is. You
6 have to put day of the week and time.

7 So that's, wants to use a generic one, that's just
8 as --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Well, if they added Monday
10 through Friday.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's fine.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: The same -- I'm just
13 trying to reduce the number of new signs.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. We need to
15 move on. Mr. Babico, what do you want to do?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I would like to have
17 that R3 -- is that R3 or 31, Johnny?

18 MR. BHULLAR: R30 --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Is it R30 or R31CA?

20 MR. BHULLAR: You're talking about this R30 --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: R30, okay. R30 is, just
22 change that, replace that, this language here, to read
23 school days only.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I, for one, I
25 don't think you can change that sign.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Why?

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Because that sign
3 has very specific language in it. Or if you blew it up, Mr.
4 Bhullar?

5 MR. BHULLAR: Except Sunday --

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It gives you a
7 day of the week just --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, no, R30.

9 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: So what is that?

11 MR. BHULLAR: Except Sunday.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, it gives
14 you a day of the week that people know that's the day of the
15 week they cannot park.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, how about R31, R32
17 -- no, not 31. What is R32CA? No, that is parking. I have
18 seen some which says Monday through Friday.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, let's move
20 on. I'm going to say how I see this thing and then let's
21 hear from the rest of you, and move on.

22 I don't think there is anything in the vehicle
23 code or in the manual that allows you to say no parking on
24 school days period. Now, that's only my individual opinion.

25 Now, the question is that whether the Committee or

1 Caltrans think that you can do it or not. And if not, then
2 if you want you have to bring it back next time with the
3 specific language, and recommended design.

4 MR. SPEAKER: Except by permit.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's permit --

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: That's for
7 parking.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: There are some language
9 that says Monday to Friday.

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: But look,
11 Jacob, at the R30A sign, no parking 7:00 to 6:00 except
12 Sunday.

13 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: So it mean Monday to
14 Saturday.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Yeah. There
16 is an option for you to have no parking whatever, 7:00 to
17 6:00 except Saturday and Sunday. And then you can have an
18 understanding with your enforcement agency that they would
19 only enforce on school days.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I disagree.
21 That's the reason I ask you if you can put a sign that say
22 no parking on city council days. City council days are not
23 known to general public.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: No, no, if they do say
25 7:00 to 6:00 except Saturday and Sunday.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, but when
2 you say no parking on school days, what does that --

3 MR. SPEAKER: But he's not saying that.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: That's not
5 what I said. I said he could post a sign similar to the
6 R30, and then have an understanding with his enforcement
7 that they would enforce it on school days.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I disagree.
9 That's my opinion. Okay, Mr. Babico, so you want to pursue
10 this, bring it back, or you think you have enough?

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, why don't you
12 vote?

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, make a
14 motion. What's your motion?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I am submitting the
16 item. Can I make a motion on my item?

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, let somebody else
19 make the motion.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Anybody in
21 support of -- anybody has a motion on this item?

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Jacob,, one of
23 the problems with what you presented was not only the hang-
24 up we're having with school days, but the format's
25 nonstandard.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: What I'm saying, my
2 intent was if I can have the flexibility in the language
3 instead of the Monday to Friday, put school days only, I
4 don't need to create a new sign. No.

5 What I presented is just to clarify my intent.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, there is an
7 item. We've had more than enough discussion, I think.
8 Let's move on. I need a motion on this, colleagues. Please
9 somebody make a motion whether we clarify that the County of
10 San Bernardino and everybody else, as your authority to deal
11 with the no parking signs as they wish, or it has to come
12 back as a new addition to the California manual.

13 Motion, please. The Chair is not supposed to make
14 a motion or I would have done it a long time ago. Yes.

15 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I would move
16 that we receive and file this request. And that we
17 determine that in the rewrite of the California MUTCD we
18 will develop language that clarifies the flexibility for
19 parking signs.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I second that.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, so there is
22 a motion to receive and file this item. And so the
23 Committee is not making any -- so your motion does not tell
24 the County of San Bernardino that they can use this.

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Until the

1 language --

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Until that
3 language has been developed?

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: That would be
5 correct.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So it's the
7 Committee's understanding that these signs are not -- signs
8 at this time.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: We're
10 receiving and filing. We're not saying yes or no at this
11 time.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, there is a
13 motion and there is a second. Discussion? Okay, then I
14 have to make a discussion. I think that these signs or any
15 sign like this is entrapment of the motorists. The motorist
16 is not expected to know when school days are, where city
17 council days are, or when planning commissions are.

18 You cannot post a sign on a public roadway and say
19 do not park here, and whatever, because whatever we have in
20 the vehicle code, whether in the California MUTCD, they are
21 tied to the days of the week and hours of the day, which is
22 common knowledge by all the motorists. I think that we need
23 to make that clarification that this is part of our minutes.

24 So, we have a motion and a second.

25 All those in favor say aye.

1 (Ayes.)

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Opposition?

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So I was
5 going to go for noes. So all those that say no?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, we are
8 seven to one, motion; the vote, the motion passes.

9 Colleagues, what about a 10-, 12-minute break. Be
10 back here at quarter to 12:00. Thank you.

11 (Off the record at 11:33 a.m.)

12 (On the record at 11:48 a.m.)

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, let's call
14 the meeting back to order. Thank you. There's an
15 announcement by Ms. Wells about parking.

16 MS. WELLS: I just wanted to announce to everyone
17 that if you've parked at a city facility you can tell
18 because it has the San Jose logo on the ticket. There's a
19 validating machine over there where you will be able to get
20 free parking for you stay. So hopefully you were able --

21 MR. HOWE: -- told us that beforehand.

22 MR. SPEAKER: Yeah.

23 MS. WELLS: It would have been nice. I'm sorry.
24 Hopefully you parked across the street in the Fourth and San
25 Fernando Garage, right across the street from the library.

1 That is a city facility. I apologize for not getting that
2 information out in the packet. Thought about it yesterday,
3 so.

4 MR. SPEAKER: And where is the validating machine?

5 MS. WELLS: The validating machine is right over
6 there on the table.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

8 MS. WELLS: Hold off until the end of your stay
9 before you validate. Let me make sure -- I believe this is
10 an eight-hour validating machine, so it should be okay.
11 I'll clarify that.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Ms. Wells, if you
13 are going to be longer we have to table it and come back
14 next time.

15 (Laughter.)

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.
17 Thanks, Laura; we appreciate the hosting and helping and
18 the parking an all that.

19 Okay, we have a few items. I want to see what's
20 your pleasure, how you want to handle the agenda. I know
21 that Long Beach people have to be at the airport by 3:00,
22 and that should not be a problem.

23 Okay, Mr. Singh, we have 9-21 and then we have 9-
24 22, right?

25 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: That's it.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And then what do
2 we have more?

3 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Nothing.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So what is --
5 what did you say?

6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: We have all -- which
7 we want to discuss, also.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Let me
9 ask, put it this way. I think the Long Beach item may take
10 awhile. Do you want to go into Long Beach item, finish,
11 break for lunch? Do you want to go to Long Beach item,
12 finish everything and don't break and leave early? What's
13 your pleasure?

14 Or do you want to break now and come back in half
15 an hour and do the Long Beach at that time?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Let's see how the Long
17 Beach goes.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. If it goes
19 long, we'll stop it.

20 Okay, what is commonly referred to as Long Beach
21 item, item 9-21. It's request for permission to experiment
22 with separated/protected bikeway on the left side of the
23 two-way street. Okay, this is introduced by Mr. Fisher.

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Thank you, Mr.
25 Chairman. The League of California Cities elected to

1 sponsor a request from the City of Long Beach. I should
2 make a correction in the title where it says on the left
3 side of two-way streets. It should read on the left side of
4 two one-way streets, a pair of one-way streets. So that's
5 an important distinction.

6 Earlier in one of our items we decided that for
7 experimentation where you have federal approval, we would
8 want the agency to also get approval from the CTCDC. And
9 that's what's being followed in this case.

10 The City of Long Beach has received approval from
11 the FHWA to experiment with several bike lane features. One
12 would be the use of bicycle signal indications, which
13 already is allowed under certain conditions in the
14 California MUTCD.

15 The feds also allowed the experimentation with a
16 green bike lane. I believe the City of San Francisco also
17 has an experimentation on that. And the California MUTCD is
18 silent on any coloring of a bike lane.

19 And then the other component of their experiment
20 would be to put it on the left side of the one-way roadway.

21 And in this case it would be in the far left, next to the
22 curb. But because there is a need for parking, as well,
23 they would have the -- going from the curb they would have
24 the bicycle lane, and then parking, and then the travel
25 lanes.

1 When we first received the request we indicated
2 that there may be a conflict with the vehicle code, and that
3 the vehicle code requires vehicles to park within 18 inches
4 of the curb. So they agreed that when they have the curb,
5 and then the bike lane, and then the parked vehicles, that
6 they would have a little firm island so that parked cars
7 could legally park within 18 inches of the curb.

8 That is the request, to have a bicycle lane on the
9 left side of a roadway, but then parking outside of that.

10 In addition to that request to experiment, the
11 City of Long Beach also wanted to get an opinion from the
12 Committee regarding another idea. And that would be the
13 idea where you have a bicycle lane near the right side of
14 the roadway, but you have the curb, parking and then the
15 bicycle lane, because they didn't want to have too wide of a
16 bicycle lane. They wanted to get our opinion on having a
17 buffer between the bicycle lane and the parked vehicles.
18 And they had proposed striping it in a specific way.

19 And I think we can get to that later, but I think
20 what we'd first like to hear about is the request to
21 experiment from the City of Long Beach. And hear from Long
22 Beach are Dave Roseman, Mark Christoffels, and Rock Miller,
23 a consultant to the City of Long Beach.

24 And I'd like to then have Mark present their item.

25 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: Thank you. My name is Mark

1 Christoffels. As I introduced myself earlier, I'm the City
2 Engineer with the City of Long Beach. And thank you for
3 that brief description.

4 I want to clarify that what we're experimenting
5 with are at three different locations. We have on Second
6 Street in the City of Long Beach, we have received Federal
7 Highway Administration approval to experiment with the
8 green-painted bike lane, and a slightly different share of
9 the road sign. So that was one approval we received.

10 The second approval is in our downtown area, which
11 is where we have the one-way streets. And that is where we
12 are proposing a left-hand, left-side bicycle lane.

13 And then the third one is just an issue that we've
14 run into.

15 Rock Miller is going to give you some graphics.
16 We're going to walk you through a very very brief PowerPoint
17 presentation. But I think the graphics will help you
18 clearly understand what it is we're talking about, and the
19 different elements that you'll have to consider today.

20 And with that, Rock, do you want to start your
21 PowerPoint.

22 MR. MILLER: Okay, technical difficulty. This is
23 dark, I don't know what to do.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Help is coming.

25 MR. MILLER: Well, while he's doing that, I'm Rock

1 Miller with KOA Corporation. I'm a traffic engineering
2 consultant. I've been retained by Long Beach to work with
3 the city on the implementation of various bikeway facilities
4 in roadways that are kind of tough to apply some of the
5 traditional techniques.

6 And we've, as a result of that, started initiating
7 what could be a series of requests to consider alternative
8 features.

9 We know, as we look around the state, that a
10 number of other cities are generating similar requests, and
11 we know some of those cities are watching what we're doing.

12 And we appreciate joining with the other cities that are
13 working to provide facilities which some people call
14 innovative and other people do have other opinions about
15 them. But either way, as soon as this is working we will
16 launch into a brief presentation and show you a little bit
17 more graphically what we're talking about in Long Beach. I
18 think we're getting close; we're on-screen.

19 Thank you.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Can we dim the
21 lights?

22 MR. MILLER: All right. Again, we're talking
23 about bicycle planning in Long Beach with the focus on
24 implementation. We're basically here for three items, as
25 John explained to you before.

1 Item 1 and item 2 are being presented to you under
2 the requirements that the city bring federally approved
3 demonstrations to the Committee for your information, and
4 to, of course, accept your feedback and input on how those
5 items should potentially proceed.

6 Item 3 is a request for an opinion from you
7 regarding a striping treatment which may or may not meet
8 standards. We'd appreciate your advice on that. And if we
9 do run out of time on items 1 and 2, we can probably do item
10 3 after a break.

11 The first item is a green lane and share proposal
12 for Long Beach. We wish we could say this was a unique
13 idea, but it's actually something that was done by Salt Lake
14 City about two years ago. The city and I contacted the
15 representatives in Salt Lake City to find out what exactly
16 they'd done.

17 You can see it's a downtown scenario with about
18 six-foot-wide green stripe. It's a sharrow lane, it's not a
19 bicycle lane. It's a lane that's intended to be shared by
20 cars and bicycles.

21 Salt Lake City generally indicated that they were
22 somewhat happy with the preliminary results of the test.
23 They were actually applying to FHWA to do this in additional
24 locations so that it would be a wider experiment.

25 We, on behalf of Long Beach, basically observed

1 this, and made a similar request to do something like this
2 for Long Beach. And the FHWA, interested in collecting data
3 from additional locations, did approve the request.

4 FHWA specifically gave the city permission to use
5 the sharrow marking; it's not currently a federally
6 recognized device. It is shown in the notice of proposed
7 rulemaking that's pending, along with a thousand other pages
8 of changes. But at this point is considered a demonstration
9 device. They have given permission to many cities to use
10 it. It was not unusual for us to request.

11 They and you are entertaining requests for colored
12 pavement. They're not sure what the final benefits of
13 colored pavement will be, but they do seem to agree that
14 additional tests involving the use of colored pavement are
15 appropriate.

16 We also did recommend a special variant of the
17 share of the road sign, which is somewhat reminiscent of a
18 discussion you had about two hours ago. I think you'll see
19 what I mean.

20 Just an idea of what Second Street it is, it isn't
21 really an ordinary street. It's a street that goes through
22 a very popular restaurant row and shopping district. There
23 are approximately 13 traffic signals within about a half a
24 mile, very closely spaced with each other. It is very
25 congested. Parking is at a very high premium. And it's

1 also a very desirable bicycle route through the city.

2 Second Street is the through route that's closest
3 to the ocean. So, not only does it have local bicycle
4 traffic, but people that are attempting to ride bicycles
5 from Canada to Mexico would actually ride on this segment of
6 Second Street. So there's a very substantial presence and
7 demand for bicycles here.

8 We do apologize. Due to the construction schedule
9 and the timing of the federal letter, we were unable to
10 defer painting of this until we presented the item to you
11 for information, so we apologize for that. We've tried.
12 And I think if you look through the dates you'll everything
13 that's happened over a fairly tight schedule for this.

14 The sharrow lane was actually installed in early
15 June, as a result of the fact that the street was overlaid
16 in early June. And we needed to make a decision regarding
17 when to paint the pavement.

18 But this is an idea of what it looks like. Again,
19 you can see it's approximately a six-foot-wide green strip
20 running down the right side of Second Street in both
21 directions through this area that has such heavy traffic
22 density and heavy demand.

23 We also proposed to put this sign in there. We
24 felt that there was a need to show a sign in which the
25 bicycles was showing in front of the car. It is a sign that

1 bicycle advocacy groups have indicated they felt was a more
2 exemplar message in other areas.

3 And FHWA did seem interested in having a local
4 agency test the sign, so we thought this would be a
5 particularly appropriate place to do it, because we felt
6 that one of the messages we really needed to convey to
7 motorists is the bicycles are supposed ride potentially in
8 front of, but certainly in line with the vehicles. So this
9 sign was also proposed.

10 That summarizes demonstration number one. The
11 demonstration is underway. I can give some very preliminary
12 information on the results, but I would say, based upon the
13 three months of operation, we don't have any concerns.
14 We've not seen bicycle incidents or accidents. And we can
15 report on some of the effectiveness. But we've got a ways
16 to go as far as the full statistical valid measurement.

17 Let's move on to item 2 which I think is the one
18 that's going to be the subject of most testimony
19 controversy. This is the protected bicycle lane
20 demonstration. First, a comment on the words protected, the
21 term, protected bicycle lane, does appear throughout the
22 literature. It is not a term that was invented by Long
23 Beach. It's a term that's used for the provision of a bike
24 lane that has some form of protection that prevents cars
25 from passing through something else in order to get into the

1 bike lane.

2 The facility is currently under design. Unlike
3 the previous one, it is not under construction. We're very
4 interested in obtaining your feedback and thoughts on this
5 as we proceed.

6 But what we can say it is modeled relatively
7 closely after a facility in New York City. That facility
8 was not subject to the FHWA for review. The City of New
9 York routinely does not submit their requests to FHWA. I
10 don't know what the wisdom of that is, but they do not feel
11 that they're subject to the jurisdiction of FHWA apparently
12 with respect to certain activities.

13 Nevertheless, FHWA was very interested in the
14 facility when they learned about it, and was very interested
15 when Long Beach approached them with a proposal to do it.

16 This is a photograph of the New York City facility
17 which, I think, gives you a pretty clear feel for what it
18 looks like. Basically a parking lane was moved out from the
19 curb face to provide enough width for a bicycle lane and a
20 striped buffer.

21 I know one of the key features of this facility
22 was that it had to be wide enough to fit a street sweeper
23 through there; and that's based upon a lot of anecdotal
24 concerns regarding glass in the bike lane and other
25 features.

1 This was installed in approximately six blocks of
2 New York City. We have maintained contact with New York
3 City officials regarding how they feel this is working.

4 They've generally declared it to be a success in terms of
5 it's achieved the bicycle utilization they were looking for.

6 I can't say it's not without side effects, but New York
7 City has judged it to be effective enough that they've
8 proceeded to authorize for the staff there to proceed with
9 installation of several more miles of this facility so that
10 it would be a larger treatment for them. So we are not
11 without precedent.

12 I might also add that the New York design was kind
13 of spawned during consultation with European authorities,
14 particularly in Denmark and in Holland where these types of
15 treatment are a little bit more common. So they were
16 attempting to benefit from the expertise of European
17 countries.

18 One thing I do want to say about this before I go
19 much further is that -- well, it's covered in here -- the
20 demonstration elements that the FHWA specifically approved
21 for this design concept were the use, number one, of bicycle
22 traffic indications. John Fisher has already indicated
23 there already is a provision for use of those here in the
24 California code.

25 So, you know, we're certainly here to indicate to

1 you that the fed have authorized them for approval, but I
2 don't know that we'd be in front of you if the only thing we
3 were doing was proposing bicycle indications.

4 We have proposed some colored pavement treatments.

5 We've proposed to use them in areas where we're unable to
6 use the traffic signals to achieve a separation between
7 turning vehicles and through bicycles.

8 I'd like to come back to the traffic signal
9 indications. We're basically proposing most of the
10 intersections in these downtown areas are already
11 signalized. We're basically proposing to introduce a left-
12 turn phase that would prevent vehicles from turning left
13 into the bikeway when the bikeway has a green phase, as
14 indicated by the bicycle traffic signals.

15 Formerly it was just a two-phase signal, green,
16 north, south and east, west. These signals will be modified
17 to have a green phase for the one-way street with a left-
18 turn arrow red, while the bicycle and the parallel crosswalk
19 are green. Then at the end of that phase a vehicle arrow
20 will come up and the vehicles will pass through both the
21 crosswalk and the bikeway.

22 I might add that we feel that the left-turn arrow
23 separating conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles is
24 kind of an added benefit of this. We actually see the
25 separation of those conflicts to be perhaps as substantial

1 as the conflicts between vehicles and bicycles.

2 It does require incidental bike signage mostly
3 having to do with how you would designate bikes to enter the
4 facility, how you would discourage bikes from entering the
5 facility in the wrong direction, and the like. But most of
6 the signs that are associated with this generally are things
7 like bicycles, wrong way and things like that.

8 This is a rendering of how the city envisions the
9 facility might look. I think it's going to be subject to
10 the fine tuning of the demonstration. At this point we're
11 proposing a demonstration which would look much more like
12 the New York City facility which basically shows delinear. And as Mr. Fisher indicated, we will be constructing a
13 temporary berm so that we can have no confusion with the
14 vehicle code over the position of vehicles parked adjacent
15 to the curb.
16

17 The third item that we wanted to talk to you about
18 is again requesting an opinion from the Commission that we
19 would like to consider as far as which way to go.

20 We're basically looking for an optimum treatment
21 to stripe a very wide curb lane and parking lane for a
22 bicycle facility. There doesn't appear to be any striping
23 treatments in either the federal or the California MUTCD
24 that will quite work on this.

25 The city has not applied to FHWA for a

1 demonstration at this time. We're not sure what we
2 constitute a demonstration particularly because it more
3 involves the way you would use standard stripes rather than
4 developing a new stripe. But if this was approved, we'd
5 consider appropriate application to the federal government,
6 and might actually apply this at various other locations
7 through the city.

8 To give you an idea, this is kind of an existing
9 condition. It's the same Second Street, but it's about a
10 half a mile further away where the street has a very
11 different character. It has a third travel lane which is
12 relatively lightly used, as you can see from the tire black.

13 And it's generally been felt that on a trial basis the city
14 may not need that third travel lane, and would like to try
15 to do something better than the relatively narrow bicycle
16 lane adjacent to the parked cars.

17 An alternative that uses all standard stripes
18 would be to provide two stripes for a bike lane, providing
19 an adequate buffer from the doors of the parked cars, as
20 well as providing an adequate buffer so that motor vehicles
21 aren't traveling that close to bicycles.

22 This figure probably should show the bike lane
23 stripes would be six inches wide. Optically they probably
24 look like four inches, but our intent would be that the bike
25 lane would be bordered by two six-inch stripes and there

1 would be a travel lane stripe. And, again, this would place
2 the bike lane in an area that we feel would be optimum in
3 terms of minimizing risk of both opening doors on the
4 parking car side, and minimizing the exposure.

5 In our studies of this we came across another
6 interesting idea back in New York City, where I know they're
7 doing a lot of tests without the FHWA evaluation. This is a
8 solution they've come up with back in New York City, which
9 we've wondered basically, and this is probably where we're
10 looking for your opinion, I think we're asking you, would
11 you be interested in further exploring a concept that might
12 look something like this? Or would you be more interested
13 in deciding whether this is an appropriate concept?

14 Again, I think our concern with this is that might
15 look a little bit too discouraging for vehicles to believe
16 they could still park at the curb. Whereas, this type of
17 striping appears that parked vehicles have no problem
18 understanding that they can park as long as they're close to
19 the curb.

20 So, that completes my presentation. Our potential
21 actions on this one was do you feel that that three-stripe
22 version complies or does not comply with MUTCD? If you feel
23 it does not comply, then we will consider whether we want to
24 request a demonstration. If we do request a demonstration,
25 I think we'd like some preliminary thoughts from you

1 regarding whether a three-stripe approach is the best; of if
2 perhaps something like the New York City approach should be
3 done. And then, lastly, how would we proceed?

4 So that concludes my formal presentation, but I'm
5 here to answer questions. And I think we'd like the
6 opportunity to respond if any issues are raised by other
7 parties regarding this.

8 We know you received a lot of correspondence.
9 We've seen one of the letters. And I know there's several
10 people here that will offer testimony. We really don't know
11 what that's going to be.

12 And I'd be happy to answer your questions right
13 now.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Can you get the
15 lights, please. Okay, thanks, Rock. Okay, colleagues,
16 let's start taking it one at a time. There two different
17 issues, two different projects. Let's go. And, Mr. Miller,
18 let's go with one of them at a time.

19 Mr. Fisher, --

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Will you please allow me
21 to sit here because I --

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Absolutely. Mr.
23 Fisher.

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I'd like to
25 ask the City of Long Beach to further clarify their request.

1 In part one where you're showing the sharrows with the,
2 I'll call it the green carpet treatment, for a bike route,
3 not a bike lane, would the sharrows be used in compliance
4 with what is already in the California MUTCD?

5 MR. MILLER: This application of sharrows would be
6 in compliance with the MUTCD with respect to it as being
7 used adjacent to a parking lane.

8 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Okay.

9 MR. MILLER: We have become aware of some interest
10 and concerns regarding the parking lane issue and sharrows,
11 and we may come back with that in the future. But, in this
12 case parking is generally allowed. That happens to be a bus
13 stop, so it's a modest exception. I guess we would ask
14 permission to put it in an area that's incidentally
15 prohibited. But generally speaking, parking is allowed
16 along about 80 to 90 percent of the street.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Okay, so the
18 request to experiment here is for the green carpet
19 treatment?

20 MR. MILLER: We are here to present the
21 information to you that we've applied to the federal
22 government for a request to experiment with items which are
23 not approved by the federal government.

24 We've brought the application to you for your
25 information, as required by the MUTCD for California up

1 until an action you took a couple hours ago. But I think we
2 would be more than willing to discuss features with you and
3 get your thoughts on this --

4 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: I think to clarify the
5 question, this particular item we're taking one at a time,
6 and the picture you have before you is the green paint,
7 which is -- nothing is really said regarding that use of
8 that colored pavement for this purpose.

9 And then we showed you the modified sign, the
10 share-the-road sign.

11 So, specifically to item one, where we've got
12 Federal Highway permission, is the green paint and the
13 different share-the-road sign. So that would be item one
14 that would be addressed at this point.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, yeah, so
16 let's focus on those two areas and then we go to the next
17 one. Mr. Knowles.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So it is truly green
19 paint and not colored asphalt?

20 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: Correct.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It's not -- okay.

22 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: Being as it's a demonstration,
23 I didn't want to go to the expense at this point of having
24 colored asphalt and then finding out a year from now this
25 isn't a good thing, and then having to take it all out.

1 At least with the --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And, again, -- and so
3 it is paint, even those legends aren't thermoplastic? It's
4 all paint?

5 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: Correct. Right now the
6 experiment is entirely done with paint.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And you say it's
8 consistent with the MUTCD, but it looks like we're not
9 encouraging the bikes to be as far to the right of the
10 travel lane as possible. I was wondering, did you say the
11 green was six feet wide, as opposed to where the bikes
12 normally would be?

13 MR. MILLER: The state law reads as far to the
14 right as it be considered safe. I know there's a lot of
15 interpretation about where that is. But if you were to
16 determine where the average door swing opens you would
17 conclude that a bicycle pretty much substantially has to be
18 very close to the center of the sharrow marking in order to
19 assure themselves of safety from an opening door.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So how far out are we
21 from the curb face, and how wide -- that was six feet wide,
22 and how far out from the curb face?

23 MR. MILLER: It's a ten-foot travel lane and
24 eight-foot parking lane. So the center of the sharrow is
25 approximately 13 feet from the curb face.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Other questions?

2 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: There is, also to add to that,
3 this was done obviously with input from users, cyclists in
4 particular. And they felt that the issue with sharing a
5 lane is that you're definitely visible. And it doesn't
6 occur to the motorist that you're just kind of meandering
7 out from the parked cars. You're actually taking the lane.

8 In order to make that clearly evident, you have
9 this centered, for the most part, in the lane. And we don't
10 get that driver or cyclist confusion of is it a cyclist
11 who's actually just kind of, should be hugging the right
12 side, but isn't properly doing so.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I guess my
14 concern was typically when we add a bike lane stretch on a
15 roadway, the bicyclist would go from being fairly close to
16 the break between the concrete gutter and the asphalt lip,
17 and they'll actually, since it's my lane, they'll move very
18 close to the stripe, to get as far away from the debris, but
19 actually puts the bike closer to traffic.

20 So, with this so wide, I would imagine the
21 bicyclist likes to use as much of that as they can because
22 it feels like their space. So there's no tendency
23 whatsoever to pull to the right to let a car by.

24 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: Yeah, and obviously we just
25 started this experiment, but in observing the cyclists using

1 it, you're correct. They generally are looking at somewhere
2 in the center as they're riding. Some are still kind of
3 leaning to the right, probably, because that's habit. But a
4 lot of them are now centering themselves on the way.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Fisher.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Yeah, that
7 adds two more questions. That City of San Francisco has a
8 request to experiment with the green pavement, but they're
9 using it for an exclusive bike lane. Here it's being used
10 as a shared facility.

11 So my first question would be do you have any
12 plans to test motorists to see if they understand that this
13 means a shared facility versus an exclusive one?

14 MR. MILLER: As a condition of the federal
15 demonstration, we're required to report back on the success
16 or failure of the experiment. We are in the process of
17 continuously compiling data on it.

18 We collected a considerable amount of before data.
19 We've monitored the facility closely throughout the summer
20 that it's been in existence, measuring the way people use it
21 and things like that.

22 We don't have enough data to statistically come
23 back and say how it's working. But we are under obligations
24 to our federal demonstration to come back to them. And we'd
25 be happy to share the information with you regarding how

1 it's working.

2 Relative to the question that was just raised, I
3 don't see cars going partially to the left to pass bicycles
4 in this facility. I generally see cars changing lanes, to
5 go to the left lane in order to go faster than a bicycle.

6 And perhaps the one point I didn't make clear is
7 cars don't go much faster than about 20 miles an hour on
8 this roadway, just due to the nature of the traffic
9 congestion there.

10 So, it's not a speed differential. A bicycle, on
11 average, will be a little bit slower than a car, but it's
12 not a 45-mile-an-hour car and 15-mile-an-hour bicycle.
13 They're quite compatible with each other in speed.

14 And there are many other reasons for vehicles in
15 the right lane that end up moving to the left lane.
16 Bicycles just happen to be one of them.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: And then my
18 other question was going to be on the watch-the-road sign.
19 I assume that's part of the experiment you're bringing to
20 the CTCDC. How did you develop that format versus others?

21 MR. MILLER: We found that format in literature
22 available as advocated by other groups that have felt that
23 some of the existing share-the-road signs don't quite
24 clearly indicate the expectation of what it means.

25 And we felt, for this project, it was really

1 important that we show the bicycle and the vehicle in more
2 or less the same line. A share-the-road doesn't really
3 distinguish whether a bicycle should be in front of you and
4 move to the right, whereas we felt this was really important
5 to indicate that you should expect to see a bicycle in front
6 of you.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other
8 questions, Mr. Fisher? From any other members? Mr.
9 Knowles.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: One follow-up on this
11 sign. I believe we saw this when the issue came up in Santa
12 Cruz. And the discussion was eliminate the second passenger
13 in the car because the whole purposes of showing a person in
14 the car is so you can tell what direction the car's going.

15 And that although it's politically correct, share
16 the ride, it does make confusion when we're looking at the
17 sign. So I think we had already told Caltrans in Santa
18 Cruz, I believe, to eliminate the second person in the car.

19 MR. MILLER: I would have to look at the actual
20 signs to see if we heard that. It has been installed, but
21 certainly if at the end of this process that was the only
22 order we received, we would probably not be that concerned
23 about the recommendation.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Eliminate the
25 second --

1 MR. MILLER: I think we'd have -- well, we could
2 probably put reflective shield over the second person, if
3 asked to.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: A little yellow --
5 yeah.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Just use a yellow
7 highlight. Mr. Miller, a couple questions. The experiment
8 that San Francisco is doing, and Mr. Fisher referred to
9 that, if these things are going to become approved and
10 become part of the manual, what is the message that the
11 green pavement is sending to the motorist? Is this
12 exclusive bike lane, or shared bike lane?

13 MR. MILLER: In terms of usage of the facility,
14 upon implementation it appeared that a few motorists weren't
15 sure what the intent of the marking was. But within a few
16 weeks it seemed like most motorists got it.

17 I believe we're using the colored pavement under
18 the continuing philosophy that's being used in areas where
19 there's a potential for interaction between motor vehicles
20 and bicycles. Which, in this case, would be largely the
21 full extent of the roadway.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, but my
23 question was that ultimately we have to bring it to some
24 kind of resolution that green pavement cannot be used for
25 both an exclusive bike lane, and a shared bike lane.

1 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: Yeah, I can --

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Ultimately the
3 message to the driver must be clear that if they see a green
4 pavement. Because if these things are going to be start
5 using as a standard all over California, then we need to be
6 clear. Are these shared facilities or exclusives.

7 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: I think our intent is to use
8 the green paint to identify when you have a potential
9 conflict between a motorist and a cyclist. If it's an
10 exclusive bike lane where you don't have a conflict --
11 because that's true of some of the other cities in the
12 United States that are experimenting around with this,
13 they're generally using that paint, for example, in a
14 protected bike lane situation, when it's crossing the
15 intersection.

16 And I can tell some of you have seen the
17 literature on that, where they painted it green as you're
18 coming across the intersection.

19 The purpose, again, is to identify there may be --
20 to the motorist there may be a cyclist in that area.

21 And I think that's our intent in the City of Long
22 Beach, too. I don't imagine myself painting every bike lane
23 I've got green. The maintenance costs would be exorbitant.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, -- the
25 paint. When San Francisco came to us, one thing we asked

1 them was about the slippery surface when it's wet, which is
2 Long Beach is going to happen a lot, even if you don't have
3 rain. There are so many foggy days and all that.

4 And one of the reasons we moved away from the
5 ladder crosswalks were a lot of these slippery issues, other
6 than maintenance and all that.

7 We told them to go work with Caltrans -- because
8 you have a pretty good lab up in Sacramento -- to come up
9 with a surface that's going to provide the maximum skid-
10 resistance. What are you using for this?

11 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: If you saw it, the roadway was
12 resurfaced. It was resurfaced with a very coarse slurry
13 seal to add some granular material to the surface to make it
14 -- and then again we just used paint. But what we used is
15 the same paint that they use on aircraft runways.

16 And we decided that's part of the experiment to
17 see how that works. Not only is there a concern about
18 water, in general, but right at the intersections you have
19 vehicles that are dripping potentially oil right where the
20 cyclists would be coming to a stop.

21 And so all of those things we're going to evaluate
22 during this period. And hopefully, through an end report,
23 be able to conclude is this the correct way of doing it.
24 Should there be other considerations as we go forward.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And a question of

1 curiosity. How much does it cost per square yard, square
2 feet, however you measure it?

3 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: I don't have that information
4 with me, but we can provide it to you.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thanks.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Just a quick question.
7 How are you going to know this is a success? I mean what
8 are you measuring -- you know, what are your performance
9 measures or your measures in --

10 MR. MILLER: The one performance measure that is
11 already starting to look clear to us is where bicycles are
12 currently using the roadway. We did a very substantial
13 before study and concluded that a vast majority of bicycles
14 were either riding within the door zone or on the sidewalk.

15 We've done a number of spot surveys since the
16 facility went in, and I wish I could report that door zone
17 riding was way down. I can't really do that. But I can
18 report that it does appear that sidewalk riding is way down.

19 And our conclusion is that bicyclists that were
20 uncomfortable riding in the door zone do appear to be
21 comfortable riding in the green zone. And we believe that
22 actually a reduction in sidewalk bicycling, particularly in
23 this area, is going to be a positive.

24 FHWA asked us to evaluate lane utilization,
25 frequency of conflicts and a variety of other factors which

1 they thought would be fairly important. And, you know,
2 we've already -- they want us to measure the distance
3 between motorists passing bicyclists. And we've already
4 concluded that most motorists change lanes rather than pass
5 close by.

6 So we think there's adequate performance data
7 there. We don't know how long the demonstration will last,
8 but I think it'll be long enough that, you know, if there is
9 a real safety issue I think that'll become apparent.

10 We know we made it through a very long, very busy
11 summer without any bicycle accidents being reported to us.
12 And it was actually -- we were very worried if there was
13 going to be a problem it was going to be the first week.
14 But, I'm very pleased to say that we got through a very busy
15 summer with a minimum of issues.

16 A few motorists contacted the city, I understand,
17 and asked if they can drive in the lane. And that seems to
18 be the biggest issue.

19 There's a lot of discussion; you can go on the
20 internet, put Long Beach Sharrows in the internet and you'll
21 get a wide variety of discussion by the whole country about
22 whether it's a good idea or not.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Presleigh.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: I'm just curious if
25 you thought about putting a green stripe on the site,

1 itself, just to kind of give the motorists an opportunity to
2 know that it's a share lane.

3 MR. MILLER: Yes, we have.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: You have.

5 MR. MILLER: We didn't do it.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: I'm curious to see
7 how --

8 MR. MILLER: Yeah, --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: -- the results of
10 that.

11 MR. MILLER: Yeah. It would be interesting.
12 Actually the stripe went in a week or so before the signs
13 went in. And I was personally feeling that the signs needed
14 to go in a little bit faster to really let motorists and
15 cyclists know that both were supposed to use it.

16 At that time I thought that perhaps putting green
17 on the sign might have been appropriate, but we just didn't
18 have the foresight beforehand to do that.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other
20 question? Chief.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: We had some of this
22 discussion, I mean similar to this when we were talking
23 about where to place the loop detectors to detect the
24 bicycles and all that. Because the vehicle code does say
25 you have to ride a bike as close as practical to the right-

1 hand edge.

2 This is definitely putting bikes out in the middle
3 of the lane. With a green stripe that wide you are putting
4 them dead set in the middle lane. You're not moving them
5 past the door zone. You are making them take the entire
6 lane, which is in conflict with what they're supposed to be
7 doing.

8 I also think that the green stripe is confusing to
9 motorists because it clear is a huge picture of a bicycle
10 that's painted a different color than the asphalt. It
11 appears that cars are not allowed to use that lane. So I
12 don't really think that it really complies with the way
13 things are supposed to be done.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: A quick question. So
15 the FHWA has seen this sign and they say go ahead and
16 experiment with it?

17 MR. MILLER: That's correct. The sign was
18 included in the application to FHWA. And the letter, which
19 I believe, was omitted from your package inadvertently
20 specifically indicates that the city received approval to
21 use this sign.

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Does the FHWA
23 know that California already has another experimentation
24 with the yellow -- with the green pavement for exclusive
25 bike lane?

1 MR. MILLER: I don't know the answer to that
2 question.

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I believe we
4 have San Francisco to seek FHWA approval.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, yeah, but
6 I'm saying is that, and again, you know, I'm going with what
7 the Chief is saying, is that we are sending two messages out
8 there. We are saying that if you see a green pavement, is
9 it exclusive bike lane or sharing the lane with the bike
10 lane.

11 You cannot use green for both conditions. We, as
12 a state, if we decide that these are going to be standards,
13 we have to decide it's either/or. We cannot say that, well,
14 if you see the green pavement sometimes it's exclusive,
15 sometimes it's shared. That's what I'm saying, that
16 ultimately that has to be resolved.

17 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: Mr. Chairman.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I'd like to hear
19 Mr. Christoffels.

20 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: I think we concur, but
21 obviously the purpose of the experimentation is to give you
22 the data to make that decision and --

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, I
24 understand that, but what I'm saying is that --

25 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: So for a while we are going to

1 have some conflicts here.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah. Ultimately
3 we have to come to some kind of resolution. Is this like
4 for shared facility or exclusive.

5 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: And even to address the other
6 comment made earlier, you're correct about it, you know, the
7 cyclists being told they should right to the right as far as
8 practical. And, in essence, we're encouraging something
9 different than that.

10 But, again, you know, we are experimenting. We
11 are not making this a permanent installation.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, that's
13 not --

14 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: -- not deliberately, you know.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Exactly.

16 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: You know, so the idea is to get
17 data to see if this works or not.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, it's not
19 standard devices. Under experimentation. Mr. Babico.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: You raise that question.
21 The purpose of this experimentation, they are coming to us
22 to use the share bike lane. Okay. They are findings will
23 be documented and they will present it to us.

24 The purpose of this experimentation is to use for
25 the shared lane. So, we do have the City of San Francisco

1 exclusively one lane for the bike. But this experimentation
2 is separately, and they will get all the documentation and
3 surveys, the study they will do. And they will see the
4 impacts and we will decide based on that.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Chief.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: But are you skewing the
7 results of what you're going to find, as far as measuring
8 your success, because you decrease conflicts and you haven't
9 had a bike accident. If by the way it is marked that you
10 are basically telling many drivers they're not supposed to
11 be there. They think they're not supposed to be there.

12 Are you skewing the true results of trying to
13 share a lane and trying to make bicycles and motor vehicles
14 cohabitate? Or are you funneling all those cars out or a
15 vast majority of those cars out? And you're not really
16 getting a true --

17 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: I think the congestion level on
18 this street really avoids the funneling of all the cars out
19 of this area. With rare exception, most of the time both
20 lanes need to be occupied as you're moving through there.

21 And with a traveling speed, an average speed of
22 about 20 miles an hour, the propensity of cars to want to go
23 around the cyclists is pretty de minimis in this particular
24 incidence, because it's not gaining you much. The motorists
25 know that. It's only during those rare times when traffic

1 is fairly light that you're going to see that activity.

2 But I can tell you during the peak hours the
3 cyclist is the one getting frustrated because they could
4 actually cycle through this area faster than the vehicle
5 movement between the intersections.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Well, the last
7 gentleman just said that most cars are changing lanes.

8 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: When there's room to do so. I
9 don't want you to think that on this particular street
10 that's a common occurrence.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, any other
12 questions? Mr. Knowles.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I may have missed it.
14 When, in providing documentation as an experiment so we can
15 truly learn from this, you're collecting all before-and-
16 after collision data, speed data, volume data so we can
17 really see bicycle usage, you know, vehicle diversion onto
18 parallel streets, all that kind of thing. So we can say did
19 it work on this street on these particular blocks, but under
20 what conditions did that work.

21 So you're providing that documentation as part of
22 the experiment?

23 MR. MILLER: I think the answer is generally yes.
24 If there's some things we didn't think to collect before we
25 did the experiment, we may find it difficult to re-collect

1 that information. But I think we'd be more than willing to
2 provide our reasonable data that can't still be collected
3 regarding this, both for FHWA and for you, as long as it's
4 data that would be reasonable to collect.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: When you say reasonably
6 low volumes, I'd like to know, well, what was that volume.
7 Or, you know, traffic is --

8 MR. MILLER: Yes.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- going about this
10 fast. You know, did you do a travel time and delay study;
11 do you have RADAR information that, you know, just so we can
12 quantify this.

13 MR. MILLER: Yeah. Again, some of the information
14 about before conditions might be difficult. What we can
15 tell you is, you know, is the bicycle traffic here isn't
16 heavy enough that there's a pack of bicyclists there at all
17 time.

18 And it's pretty easy to see how the street
19 operates in between bicycles. And it's easy to see how the
20 street operates when there's cyclists present. And it would
21 be very easy to show the difference between how it operates
22 with and without a bicyclist.

23 And as I've indicated before, the two most common
24 things we see are the motorists following the bicycle, not
25 caring. Or the motorist feeling the bicycle is impeding

1 their travel and they're making a lane change, just as they
2 would around a vehicle backing into a parallel parking space
3 or a meter maid doing parking enforcement.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right, but you know,
5 too, what I mean, I want to know enough about -- if this is
6 a great success on this street -- I want to know enough
7 about this street so I know that, well, in city B, we have
8 the exact same condition and that should work here, too.

9 MR. MILLER: I think we can certainly do that.
10 The 40,000 cars, four lanes, single area 200 feet. Those
11 would be the initial criteria that I would probably suggest
12 to apply.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, Mr. Henley.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Just a quick question.
15 Do you have lane volumes, you know, before and after, or --

16 MR. MILLER: We did some observations before and
17 determined that the lane utilization was pretty close to
18 50/50. And we know, due to the recurrent congestion pattern
19 out there, that it's highly unlikely that we'll find any
20 significant difference in lane utilization.

21 You know, if the bicycle riding goes up to
22 thousands an hour, you could seem something unusual. But,
23 bicycle, you know, it's one, two, three minutes at this
24 point.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other

1 questions? By the way, how come you guys don't have green
2 ties? Look at Dave, you know, --

3 (Laughter.)

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It's a green
5 pavement, you need a green tie. You got it.

6 Okay, any other --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Can we maybe, you know,
8 like say -- about three almost proposals. Do we have one
9 independently?

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Doing them one
11 independently. This already is confusing, as is. We don't
12 want to mix them all together. Let's finish with one. And
13 I'm going to break the public comments part, also, that
14 bring public in only on this one. And then we are going to
15 do this one. And then move to the one for the other one.
16 Because otherwise, too many issues at the same time.

17 No other questions? Mr. Fisher.

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I just had one
19 and it's really a comment. I'm certainly inclined to allow
20 the experiment to proceed. The only dilemma I'm thinking
21 about is a year or two ahead.

22 Let's say the experiment works okay, not really a
23 problem. I'm still not going to know at the end of the day
24 whether a striped green pattern is good for shared lane. Or
25 I'm not going to know if that's the best sign possible to

1 convey shared use, because we're not really testing any
2 other types of signs.

3 So it might work okay, but I think the dilemma we
4 might be faced with in two years is is it compelling enough
5 to say that should be the sign, or that should be the
6 treatment for something like this.

7 So I don't know if you're collecting any other
8 data that would give us a compelling reason other than it
9 works okay.

10 MR. MILLER: I tend to agree with those comments.
11 I don't know what we, in Long Beach, will be able to do to
12 address those comments. One thing I know that has happened
13 is we've heard from a number of communities that have
14 installed sharrows alone.

15 And I think it's going to be very possible to
16 contrast the evaluation of our treatment with the green
17 compared to the treatment of other communities with just a
18 sharrow, by itself.

19 And the general tone of those comments were
20 they're kind of disappointed in how they're working and are
21 ours working any better. And we really can't compare them
22 yet, but I think we're probably going to end up receiving
23 information from other communities that seem to be very
24 interested in possibly amplifying their treatment with this
25 type of treatment.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I know Pasadena
2 is using them. Probably Long Beach used them also without
3 the green pavement, didn't they?

4 MR. MILLER: We've installed a few sharrows in
5 Long Beach, but they went in about the same schedule as this
6 project.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: About the same
8 schedule.

9 MR. MILLER: Most of them are in northern
10 California.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Babico.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Do you have the striping
13 plan, a slide for that?

14 MR. MILLER: A plan showing the actual striping?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah, with the sign.

16 MR. MILLER: I don't think I brought that with me,
17 but I might be able to find it.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay. What you are
19 showing is the green paint, which is a bike lane share, is
20 in the middle.

21 MR. MILLER: Correct.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay. On the right-hand
23 side is the bus lane --

24 MR. MILLER: For this 60 feet, but it's parallel
25 parking --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Where is the sign
2 located?

3 MR. MILLER: The signs are generally located
4 toward the beginning of every other block.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: But my point is that at
6 this location here it will be far right, --

7 MR. MILLER: That's right.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: -- the sign which
9 indicates the bike-in-lane.

10 MR. MILLER: Right.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I would like -- in your
12 document you see the impact or the effect of the sign being
13 shown laterally to the right, whether the drivers recognize
14 that or not, because it's too far to the right.

15 MR. MILLER: We can ponder that. I don't know
16 what we're going to be able to do because of having already
17 installed it. Although, you know, if we had a --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Because the
19 effectiveness of the sign is closer to the right-hand side,
20 rather than being installed laterally away, then --

21 MR. MILLER: Yeah, if we had a measurable
22 performance indicator that could do that, that would allow
23 us to experiment with an alternate placement, I think that
24 would be something that would be do-able.

25 You know, if everything else looks good and you

1 really want to talk about overhead, I don't know that we
2 want to do that. But, you know, I think we've got an
3 opportunity here --

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Right.

5 MR. MILLER: -- to do some testing.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yes.

7 MR. MILLER: But, we just, you know, there's
8 things that we've done that would be difficult to undo. We
9 certainly wouldn't want to change color of the paint.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: So, following up with,
11 I think, what John said, it sounds like there's an
12 opportunity in terms of driver understanding to use not only
13 your bikes in-lane sign, but also, for example, the semi-
14 standard language here, the lane language. It would fit on
15 the exact same sized placard. To see whether the motorists
16 have a better understanding of seeing the bike and the car
17 and the message, share the lane. Versus just the bike and
18 the car, and bike in-lane.

19 I would think it would be more clear if we used
20 the language, share the lane. And you experiment with
21 different signs. You'd be able to actually ask the motorist
22 which is clearer to you.

23 MR. MILLER: Yeah. We have not done that. That
24 probably would be a reasonable request. I mean I'm not here
25 to spend the city's money, but the cost of the signs is

1 fairly nominal compared to the cost of what they've done
2 already.

3 And it does strike me there would be an
4 opportunity to put one type of sign in one direction, and
5 another type of sign in the other direction. It's tough to
6 interview that many motorists for this, but --

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I know, --

8 MR. MILLER: -- there may be ways of measuring
9 whether it works different --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: -- FHWA approval for
11 that sign.

12 MR. MILLER: That's right.

13 MR. SPEAKER: Is that right?

14 MR. MILLER: Yeah well, -- I think, you know, if
15 we would have to bring back FHWA for additional
16 consideration we could do that. But I think if the
17 modifications are within the scope of things that are
18 unconditionally approved in California, we would probably
19 feel a little bit different about it than if we were testing
20 something else that's, you know, a deviation from standard.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Chief.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Can you realistically
23 even test how two different signs affect anything with such
24 a dramatic pavement treatment? I mean, with that right
25 there, that green carpet, are you going to be able to tell

1 which of two signs makes any difference, really?

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, but pretend
3 you can.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: You survey a driver.
5 You hand out a survey to somebody getting out of a parked
6 car. And you say, --

7 MR. SPEAKER: I saw the green carpet.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- which do you
9 understand better.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, any other
11 questions? If not, it's open to public. Okay. This is a
12 multi-experimentation request, so, members of the public,
13 please only stay on this single one. We're going to come to
14 the other ones.

15 Anybody wishes to address the Committee? Mr.
16 Shanteau. Appreciate it if you'd keep your comments to five
17 minutes. I'll remind you of time.

18 DR. SHANTEAU: Yes, Mr. Bahadori. Bob Shanteau,
19 California Association of Bicycling Organizations. There
20 are several comments we have questions and concerns about.

21 One is that the experiment with the colored bike
22 lane in San Francisco you'll see on page, actually of the
23 handout that Devinder gave out shortly after my comment
24 during public comments today, item 06-2, which is the San
25 Francisco experiment with colored bike lane.

1 Status: No update received. You don't have any
2 information on whether that's working or not. You have no
3 information whether it's been installed. Nothing.

4 Number two. Long Beach did not tell the Federal
5 Highway Administration about that experiment in their
6 application.

7 Number three. The bikes-in-lane sign was brought
8 to you in May of 2008 in San Francisco. You referred it to
9 the California Bicycle Advisory Committee. The California
10 Bicycle Advisory Committee said to Caltrans at the time, get
11 a human factor study on that, which would address Mr.
12 Knowles' question, do drivers understand it. Caltrans
13 didn't do it. The City of Long Beach did not inform FHWA of
14 that application or what happened after it at the California
15 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting.

16 As far as whether bicyclists have the right in
17 California to ride in the center of that lane, I helped
18 write California vehicle code section 21202(a)(3), which
19 says that one of the exceptions to having to ride as far to
20 the right as practicable is when there is a substandard-
21 width lane.

22 The definition of a substandard-width lane, for
23 the purposes of this section, are a lane that is too narrow
24 for a bicycle and a vehicle to travel safely side-by-side
25 within the lane. I wrote that in 1975. Okay. That's what

1 the law says.

2 Therefore, as a bicyclist, when I see a lane that
3 is too narrow for a vehicle and a bicycle to travel safely
4 side by side within the lane, I am not subject to vehicle
5 code section 21202, which requires me normally to ride as
6 far right as practicable. Unfortunately, that's almost
7 never -- almost all lanes are too narrow. And certainly in
8 cities such as this one.

9 So, what that does mean, however, is that I must
10 be subject to some other section of the vehicle code which
11 means -- and that other section is 21654, I'm a slow-moving
12 vehicle now. I'm subject to the same law as any other slow-
13 moving vehicle. The slow-moving vehicle law says that if
14 you're moving slower than the speed of other traffic, you
15 shall either -- not either, you shall ride, you shall drive
16 in the right lane or as far to the right as practicable.

17 In legal terms we understand that to mean in the
18 right lane, if one exists. Otherwise, as far to the right
19 as practicable. In other words, an un-laned road, which we
20 hardly have anymore. But that's what the law says.

21 If it's a laned road, we are required to ride in
22 the right lane. So once we are not subject to 21202, we are
23 subject to 21654. We can ride anywhere in that lane.
24 That's our lane. That entire lane is ours now. We refer to
25 that as controlling the lane, not taking it, controlling the

1 lane. It's ours.

2 Now, if you're going to question why, if a car
3 comes along behind me and wants to pass me, why don't I have
4 to move right to allow that car to pass. The answer is
5 because that's a multi-lane road. This is not a two-lane
6 road. Two-lane roads are subject to 21656, the five-cars-
7 behind-you law. We are not subject to that on a multi-laned
8 road like this. This is 21654, which only says that we have
9 to ride in the right lane if we're traveling slower than
10 other traffic.

11 If there's a tradeoff, if you're saying, but I
12 could ride further to the right, I'm saying that's in the
13 door zone. I never -- I, and other experienced cyclists who
14 know how to ride, never ride in the door zone.

15 By the way, I have brought with me copies of a
16 booklet that have just been published, called "Street
17 Smarts", that describe -- the first few pages describe
18 California law; the rest of it describes generally how to
19 ride a bicycle in traffic.

20 Frankly, if the members of the Committee study
21 that booklet and understand it -- one can go to the Federal
22 Highway, too -- then most of the questions you just brought
23 up you wouldn't have asked.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, Mr.
25 Shanteau, this is all good --

1 DR. SHANTEAU: The bikes, okay, the green stripe
2 should --

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- information
4 but what is your feedback, what is your position on this
5 request for experimentation?

6 DR. SHANTEAU: Why have a green stripe --

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

8 DR. SHANTEAU: -- on a road that, first of all,
9 why have a green stripe on a road to indicate that's the
10 conflict area, where, in fact, on every road in the state
11 that looks like that, bicyclists have every much -- as much
12 right to control that lane as in Long Beach. So, why bother
13 having the green stripe at all, number one.

14 And number two, I would note what Mr. Miller said,
15 that despite the green stripe bicyclists are still riding in
16 the door zone. Which means the problem is not
17 infrastructure. The problem is not striping. The problem
18 is education. The education.

19 And I know that's not the purview of CTCDC. Your
20 purview is, of course, striping, infrastructure, traffic
21 control devices. But let's not try to use traffic control
22 devices to make up for poor, poor education in the schools.

23 Which is, incidentally, one of the findings from the City
24 of Davis that was reported, that I'll be talking to you
25 about later, that education is absolutely critical for

1 increasing the number of bicyclists in a city.

2 And I don't see anything here or in any
3 application from the City of Long Beach that they are trying
4 to educate bicyclists that they are perfectly entitled to
5 use any of that lane on that road, and any other lane that
6 is too narrow for a vehicle and a bicycle to share safely
7 side by side.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: If you can
9 summarize, please. Thank you.

10 Any other members of the public? Yes.

11 MR. PYBURN: Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway
12 Administration. I think the situation where we have two
13 different experiments for the use of the green stripe, while
14 on the surface it may seem contradictory, it also provides
15 an opportunity to evaluate whether it's a intersection
16 location or a continuous conflict location. I think both
17 experiments can render some interesting information.

18 As a traffic engineer, though, I'm not sure that
19 the green stripe adds any more than the legend, itself,
20 does. I think the legend, like a diamond in a diamond lane,
21 continually reminds the driver who's allowed and not allowed
22 to use that lane.

23 In this case, green stripe or not, if the city
24 decides, based on their evaluation, to keep or not to keep
25 the green stripe, adding a car legend and a plus to the bike

1 clearly indicates bikes and cars can co-exist in that lane.

2 When I first saw this, one, I didn't know what the
3 sharrows were. And it wasn't immediately obvious to me that
4 that's a shared lane.

5 So as you do your evaluation I just throw those
6 out for consideration.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.

8 Any other members of the public? Seeing none, I close the
9 public hearing, bringing it back to the Committee.
10 Committee, what's your pleasure? They've already done this;
11 it's already in the field. They have FHWA approval.

12 Okay, let's see -- if you have any specific things
13 that you want them to look at, because they have to bring it
14 back for experimentation -- I mean for the result.

15 And my thinking is that San Francisco, by the way,
16 which we need to follow along with them, is that we are
17 going to be dealt with two set of data which are extremely
18 highly qualitative. With all due respect to my very learned
19 colleague, if anybody can pull this out of the hat, it's
20 going to be Rock Miller.

21 But you're not going to be comparing that, oh, we
22 had like, 20 accidents, and we went down to five, so it's so
23 obvious. There's going to be a lot of survey on how people
24 perceive these things. Going to be a lot of qualitative
25 analysis in there.

1 And then we are going to have this one. And then
2 we are going to have the experiment coming from San
3 Francisco. And then the decision is going to be if, first
4 of all, these things are good. And if they are good, what
5 you use them. Do you use them for shared lanes, or for
6 exclusive lanes. But that's for future.

7 For now, if you have any specific things that you
8 want Long Beach and their consultant to look and bring back
9 as part of this?

10 DR. SHANTEAU: I left out one thing.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I closed the
12 public --

13 DR. SHANTEAU: -- bicycle advisory committee.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I closed the --

15 DR. SHANTEAU: You already have a committee that
16 you can refer --

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's a good
18 comment, but I closed the public hearing. But we'll keep
19 that in mind. As the judges say, strike the comment.

20 (Laughter.)

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: With the comment, you
22 know, there's so much space between the parked cars and
23 where the bike lane sign would be, I wonder if putting more,
24 you know, where in the road, like share-the-road, -- so the
25 vehicle diagram would be helpful. To put it in the lane.

1 That would be my comment.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You guys are
3 taking notes back there?

4 MR. MILLER: Didn't hear the whole comment. It
5 was put something else on the road?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Yeah, something like
7 share-the-road, or whatever the signage does, put it in the
8 road, itself. Because it's so far from the curb and where
9 the sign would be. And bikes-in-lane generally doesn't say
10 share the road. Share-the-road says share the road, but
11 bikes-in-lane could be misinterpreted as bike lane, or that
12 there are bikes and you don't know what the vehicles are
13 supposed to be doing.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Yeah, I ride a bicycle
15 quite a bit. And I have my biases about this one way or the
16 other. And Caltrans has what we call the Caltrans Bicycle
17 Advisory Committee.

18 And, you know, the way we try to operate, in fact,
19 I committed to the operating in the future, when we have
20 issues regarding bicycles they should be coming to our
21 bicycle advisory committee first, so that we don't start
22 saying, you know, going in one direction in the bicycle, and
23 he goes another.

24 And in this case, of course, the horses are
25 already out of the barn. I would really like to have this,

1 you know, just you know, so they can get some more
2 information so they don't wind up with a whole community of
3 bicyclists, you know, fighting with them. Have them run
4 this by the bicycle advisory --

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, the bicycle
6 advisory committee is obviously a good one. As far as the
7 process, actually, I think we may want to keep it like this
8 because we don't want to waste people's time to run them
9 through the bicycle advisory committee if this committee is
10 not going to authorize the experimentation to begin with.

11 Because we have rejected requests for experimentation
12 before. Just because a local agency requests one.

13 If you remember the last one that I recall, the
14 City of Ventura, or County of Ventura, they wanted to have
15 those signs for the school bus stops and all that, you
16 remember.

17 But it's a good idea that if it's bicycle related,
18 and this Committee approves the experimentation, then we
19 send them, get approval.

20 Any other comments? Mr. Fisher.

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Well, just
22 going to repeat what I said before, primarily. I'm inclined
23 to approve the experiment. The FHWA has approved it. It's
24 in the field. I think now that it's in the field I think
25 we'd like the benefit of the data to see how well this works

1 versus what San Francisco has tried.

2 That doesn't necessarily mean that when it comes
3 decision time that we necessarily have to approve it as a
4 new device, because unless it's intuitively obvious or
5 compelling, we may not be inclined to approve it.

6 But I'd like to see what the information yields.
7 I would like to also get, maybe if you could email to me,
8 the sign, the bike-in-lane sign. I sit on another committee
9 with the feds that may be able to get some data on how well
10 people understand that sign versus the other share-the-road
11 sign. And if you could email that to me then I could see if
12 we could get the feds to experiment with it in another
13 meeting that I attend.

14 But I would like to ask that the Committee go
15 ahead and approve this part of the experiment.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So we have
17 three comments specific. Ms. Wong made one and Mr. Henley
18 about taking it to the bicycle advisory committee. Have
19 them take a look also; take their comments. And Mr. Fisher
20 had his comments. Mr. Knowles.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, somebody
22 mentioned that the City of Long Beach had some other sharrow
23 locations. And providing data about where they were used
24 before, without the green paint, I'd like to know more about
25 those streets and what the results were. Because part of

1 the issue is, is there any benefit to this green paint. And
2 if sharrows have been used anyplace else without the green.

3 I'd like to be able to compare the results of --

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Jeff, let Mr.
5 Roseman --

6 MR. ROSEMAN: We only have a handful that are
7 associated with an existing bike facility, bike lane type 2,
8 in which the type 2 facility is dropped because of a
9 narrowing roadway or an add of a lane. And the sharrow is
10 used to show that conflict.

11 So I don't know that it's exactly the same
12 situation as --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: The sharrows are in the
14 center of the lane where the road is narrowed?

15 MR. ROSEMAN: No. I believe that they are 11
16 feet, they follow the minimum dimension that's in the MUTCD,
17 which is 11 feet from the curb. So they're a little bit,
18 they're not in the exact same location is what I'm saying.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay, but it just seems
20 like -- it's hard to judge an experiment if there's no
21 comparison. So, one of the things you're experimenting with
22 is the green. And it would be good to have a contrast
23 between sharrows with a green background and sharrows
24 without a green background. And it sounds like that's the
25 closest we can get to something to compare it to.

1 MR. ROSEMAN: I think if the Committee would like
2 us to choose another similar type roadway that is not a type
3 2 facility, to install sharrows in the exact same location,
4 I think we can do that. But we're not going to be able to
5 replicate the exact volume here, because you're over 40,000
6 vehicles a day. Or the closely spaced traffic signals.
7 We're not going to be able to duplicate that.

8 There are some other arterial streets that we may
9 be able to, but I'm not exactly sure how we're going to be
10 able to compare them. But we're willing to try that.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: My concern is what have
12 we learned at the end of the day from this experiment if we
13 don't look at other contrasting ways of dealing with this.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Good point. Take
15 a look, see if you can come up with other --

16 MR. ROSEMAN: Would you like -- if you want to
17 include that, we're willing to do that.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: If you can think
19 of a street that kind of -- you cannot duplicate, I'm very
20 familiar with your city, but --

21 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah, the --

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Is that the
23 pleasure of the Committee, by the way? Do you guys see
24 benefit in having a comparative analysis between sharrows in
25 a colored pavement versus regular pavement?

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Sharrows are already
2 approved --

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, I said --

4 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: -- California MUTCD.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, but we want
6 to see how effective they are. Are they effective without
7 paint, or they're effective more --

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: How much does the green
9 paint enhance their value.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Does it add
11 value.

12 MR. ROSEMAN: Chairman, since you know our city
13 pretty well, the only place that I can think is somewhat
14 similar to this would be Bixby Knolls on Atlantic.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah.

16 MR. ROSEMAN: Because it is also a shopping area;
17 it also has a number of traffic signals. It also has a
18 pretty high volume.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, that's a
20 good example. Mr. Fisher.

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Well, as I
22 recall, in San Francisco I think what they presented was
23 that before the sharrow markings, bicyclists were traveling
24 nearer the door zone. And after the sharrow markings they
25 moved over a little bit. And therefore, it was deemed a

1 success.

2 I don't know that you've collected any before data
3 on this, have you? To determine if the green carpet
4 treatment gets them further away from the door zone?

5 MR. ROSEMAN: No, I don't believe there was --

6 MR. MILLER: We collected data regarding where
7 bicyclists travel when they use the street, dividing it into
8 three categories. Riding on the sidewalk; riding within the
9 door zone, in the opinion of the observer; and riding far
10 enough out in the middle of the street to not be exposed to
11 a hazard of opening doors.

12 We also noted, as I'd indicated before, that we
13 had very substantial riding in the door zone, very
14 substantial riding on the sidewalk. And I didn't say we
15 had, before, relatively minimal riding in the closer to the
16 center of the lane.

17 We have taken anecdotal spot observations. And as
18 I've indicated before, we see riding in the approximate
19 center of the green stripe much higher than it was before
20 the stripe was put in. We see riding on the sidewalk much
21 lower than it was before the stripe was put in. Probably no
22 change in riding within the door zone at this time.

23 And I would concur with anybody that says we may
24 have an education problem there. But it seems like the
25 people on the sidewalk are very comfortable to ride on the

1 lane, and the people that ride in the door zone haven't
2 chosen to change their behavior.

3 With respect to comparative data, I'd indicated
4 before, I could think back there of one city that's
5 contacted us that's indicated somewhat disappointment with
6 their sharrow experience. I think we probably could get
7 data from that city, and it's not too far from us.

8 Also, I was remembering a couple hours ago you
9 were all talking about Santa Cruz. I've driven on the PCH
10 in Santa Cruz, and I do think the experience of those
11 sharrows would be quite relevant in terms of how the
12 bicyclists use those sharrows. The signals are a little bit
13 further apart, but the volume is probably getting in the
14 right range.

15 So with the assistance of the Committee and
16 Caltrans, I think we probably could put together some
17 comparative data from other communities.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Not necessarily
19 to have some in Long Beach. If you can find data from other
20 cities, great. Otherwise, you know, we want to look at the
21 street that -- let's move on.

22 Any -- Chief?

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I missed it. Is there
24 an end date established for this experiment?

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Well, that's the

1 second. When are you planning to come back?

2 MR. MILLER: Our requirement to -- FHWA requires
3 us to report back to them every six months. The first
4 report would be toward the end of this year. We are, and
5 intend to compile those reports until the end of the
6 demonstration. We'll be happy to present those reports to
7 you as we report them to FHWA, as well as to amend our
8 experiment, based upon your directions.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: And when is the end of
10 demonstration?

11 MR. MILLER: The way it works with FHWA, the
12 demonstration ends either when FHWA concludes that the
13 demonstration has no value, or if FHWA concludes it is a
14 valuable tool. And they would then move towards putting it
15 into typical documents like MUTCD as an acceptable
16 treatment.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other? Ms.
18 Wong.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Yeah, also wanted to
20 mention that San Francisco, they have a hearing on November
21 2nd about the injunction. So they haven't been able to make
22 any bike improvements, and even experiments because of this
23 bike injunction. And that hearing is November 2nd. They
24 expect it to be -- the green colored lane, at the end of the
25 year or beginning next year.

1 MR. MILLER: I believe there are a lot of sharrows
2 at stake there, as well. So there could be a lot of data
3 coming out of San Francisco.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Yeah.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Any other
6 comments, questions? Okay, so we're taking verbatim minutes
7 of the meeting. So make sure you get a copy, because there
8 were a lot of comments made, so that you make sure you
9 capture all the comments.

10 Okay, let's vote on this one. Is there a motion
11 on this part of Long Beach application? This is the --

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I move
13 approval of this part of the experiment --

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There is a
15 motion. Is there a second?

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I second it.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, there's a
18 motion and second. Any discussion? Seeing none, all those
19 in favor say aye.

20 (Ayes.)

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Opposition?
22 Motion passes unanimously.

23 Okay, it's 12:00 (sic). They have other stuff,
24 also. Do you want to break for lunch, quick half an hour,
25 and come back? Half an hour, yes, no? If you guys don't

1 want lunch I'm --

2 MR. SPEAKER: I'm starving.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You're starving.

4 What's your pleasure? Mr. Fisher?

5 (Parties speaking simultaneously.)

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Half an hour.

7 Okay, the majority have it, at least half an hour. We are
8 back here at 1:30 sharp.

9 (Whereupon, at 1:00 p.m., the meeting was adjourned, to
10 reconvene at 1:30 p.m., this same day.)

11 --oOo--

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: The previous slide you
2 showed --

3 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: This direction?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Okay. The bike sign,
5 white-on-black background, is that a standard sign?

6 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: No, and that's not what we were
7 proposing.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Oh, then what is that?

9 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: It just -- we were really --
10 this graphic was obviously put together on a computer and
11 what we --

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Oh.

13 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: -- were trying to do is show
14 that ultimately you're going to get a buffered landscape
15 between the proposed bike lane.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I was trying to use it,
17 but --

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Can I ask
19 a question. If you have a physical buffer, doesn't that
20 convert it to a class 1 bike trail?

21 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: There's some debate as to
22 whether it is or isn't. And I think that's part of the
23 problem right now. Does that fit that definition of a --

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I'm just
25 thinking, you know, if there's actual physical separation

1 then it's not a bike lane, anymore. It's a class 1 bike
2 trail.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, it could be --

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It's a bike path.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: -- segmented. It could
6 be a bike lane and then a class 1.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Because then
8 technically there's no interaction between vehicles and
9 bicycles. They each have their own independent facility.

10 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: Right.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And it's just a
12 class --

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: There is
14 interaction at the intersection.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: At the
16 intersection, but it's not going to be like a trade
17 crossing. Any other questions on this part of the
18 application? Mr. Henley.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: If somebody, a person's
20 on a bicycle and wants to, you know, go to a business that's
21 across the street, you know, on the other side -- you know,
22 this is a one-way street I presume.

23 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: Correct, and you are on the
24 left side. If you --

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: How are they going to

1 get --

2 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: -- indicating you needed to
3 make a right-hand turn.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: So you come up to -- you
5 know, I just don't know how you can get there legally
6 without walking your bike half a block.

7 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: Correct. What you would be
8 doing is you would be coming to the intersection and
9 crossing as a pedestrian, for example, or riding across when
10 the protected movement is allowed. And then heading off
11 into the right direction.

12 Or, you could still legally ride, as was indicated
13 earlier, with the traffic. You don't necessarily have to
14 use this lane. You could stay to the right on the one-way
15 street; get to your destination, and then turn right and
16 head off in that direction.

17 I want to make it clear that this is not forcing
18 all the cyclists to use this. They still have the rights
19 given to them to travel in the normal travel lane on the
20 right-hand side of the road.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: The City of Davis
22 experimented with something like this quite awhile ago. And
23 they actually had it on the ground, and they abandoned it.
24 And I'm just wondering, have you guys looked at, you know,
25 the research that was don there or their experience with

1 what went on in the City of Davis?

2 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: We did. And we think we
3 resemble more the situation which is currently occurring in
4 New York than we do what they were experimenting around
5 with, which is a fully built out downtown with the one-way
6 street segments, and the heavily, you know, traffic
7 congestion, and the need to get cyclists through that area.

8 So, we did look at it. But I think right now we
9 resemble New York more than we would resemble that
10 particular experiment that was done in Davis.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: And then just one other
12 comment. I think our design manual, chapter 1000,
13 specifically prohibits this kind of a configuration. And
14 wonder -- kind of position you put us into or yourself into.

15 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: Well, I think I harken back to,
16 some of you, or perhaps all of you, received a letter from
17 -- I'm sure this gentleman's going to address it later. And
18 he talks about experimentation that was done in the late
19 '60s and early '70s, and the different bike lanes. And none
20 of that was allowed, either, back then, you know.

21 And you have to realize that there was an interest
22 in experimenting. And as a result of those experiments we
23 end up with the facilities that we have today, the bike
24 lanes that we have today, the type 1s, the type 2s.

25 Somewhere along the line you have to say to

1 yourself, we're going to try something. It may not be
2 allowed, but we're going to experiment with it. The results
3 may be bad and we'll dump the idea, as they did with some of
4 the experiments they did back in the late '60s and early
5 '70s.

6 Or, in this case, it might function just fine,
7 like it happens to be doing in New York. And we may modify
8 it and use it here in the State of California.

9 I think the purpose here is not to decide if it
10 meets a certain existing code or it doesn't. It's whether
11 we feel comfortable going forward with an experiment.

12 The City of Long Beach is very interesting in
13 hearing if you'd like to make modifications to the
14 experiment. We'd be very disappointed if you elected not to
15 do it all.

16 I think there is a great political pressure for
17 different modes of transportation and accommodating them.
18 We're seeing that on a national basis. And I think we'll do
19 ourselves a disservice if we decide we're not going to
20 experiment with this because it doesn't meet all the
21 criteria that we currently have in our codes. And I hope
22 the Committee would understand that and look at it as a
23 perspective of, like you did on the earlier example.

24 We'd like to see you look at this; we'd like to
25 see you look at that; have you considered this item. As you

1 did on the previous item, you didn't fully reject it and say
2 we're not going to experiment at all. And that's what we're
3 kind of hoping we could get today out of the meeting.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Fisher.

5 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Mark, you
6 could have come in with a request to put a bike lane on the
7 left side, but outside of the parking lane. What advantages
8 do you see in having the bike lane near the curb rather than
9 having parked vehicles next to it?

10 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: In other words leaving the
11 vehicles parked where they currently are?

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Right, and
13 having a bike lane just outside of that.

14 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: Which is a more traditional
15 approach.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Which would be
17 a mirror image of the common bike lanes that we see today.

18 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: Correct. Well, there was the
19 issue obviously of the door zone and trying to get that
20 cyclist away from that. This provides that buffer. Even on
21 the passenger side, as they're opening the doors. If you
22 look at some of the striking examples, you're not getting a
23 door, even on the passenger side, coming against you. So it
24 provides that.

25 In our third request you saw, in essence, we were

1 trying to do that there, too. Where we were asking about
2 kind of moving out the bicycle lane, and enlarging it.
3 Unfortunately, in this downtown area I don't have the luxury
4 of that kind of lane width to provide that. So this is sort
5 of another alternative.

6 You're restricted by your street width, and yet
7 you want to provide a safe means for the cyclist to go
8 through.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Other questions?
10 Mr. Babico.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: That stripe there on
12 that slide, the narrow one, what's the purpose of that? Is
13 that the buffer?

14 MR. MILLER: Are you referring to this stripe?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah.

16 MR. SPEAKER: No, the one to the left of it.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, that one.

18 MR. MILLER: That stripe -- it's a photograph from
19 New York City. New York City follows New York City
20 standards, and I believe that was some of treatments that
21 they used to optically make the lane feel a little bit
22 narrower than it really was to discourage vehicles from
23 traveling in the lane.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Oh.

25 MR. MILLER: We're not specifically proposing to

1 do that. If we found a need to do that, you know, we could
2 look back at it.

3 I do agree with Mark that Long Beach is much
4 closer to New York than it is to Davis. But it's still not
5 quite downtown Manhattan. New York drivers have been a
6 challenge to their facility. And I think Long Beach drivers
7 will do a better job than the New York City drivers did.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: But isn't that
9 exclusively for the bike user?

10 MR. MILLER: Absolutely.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Then why is the vehicle,
12 I mean the confusion between the bike and the vehicle. That
13 is only for the bicyclist.

14 MR. MILLER: Your comment about the sign in there
15 before, that sign is the New York City sign. It was
16 photo --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, no, I'm not talking
18 about the sign. I'm talking --

19 MR. MILLER: They have been having some problems
20 in New York City with vehicles driving in the bike lane.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Oh.

22 MR. MILLER: Not because they're a safety hazard,
23 but because they're a nuisance to the bicyclist in the bike
24 lane. Again, I don't think Long Beach is quite to the
25 critical mass and density of New York City. But if we were

1 to find a situation like that, we would probably start
2 looking and asking if that was something to be done.

3 There's a lot of little, small, minor striping
4 things that we've seen on New York City's striping plans,
5 which basically reminded us every state does do it a little
6 bit differently. And uniformity would say not to do that,
7 and yet if it was found to be effective, maybe that would
8 become a new treatment in the future.

9 The only thing off record I wanted to mention is
10 there's been a lot of talk of Davis' experience in the '60s
11 and '70s. I've forgot to say, Rock Miller UC Davis '73 BS,
12 '76 MS. I can't say I participated in all the research on
13 the facilities in Davis, but I do have a lot of personal
14 knowledge and I did participate in a federal research
15 project on bikeways at UC Davis between '73 and '76.

16 The conditions at Davis are as far from Long
17 Beach, much further from Long Beach than Long Beach is from
18 New York City. A very suburban area. As a cyclist in
19 Davis, I knew these tests were happening. As a cyclist, I
20 and everybody knew that those lanes were full of broken
21 glass, and most cyclists simply chose not to use them.

22 I've understood anecdotally that there were
23 problems with wrong-way cyclists -- but a lot of those
24 problems are reasons we have features such as making sure
25 that the division is provided at all the uncontrolled

1 locations. And a lot the colored pavement.

2 And basically I think we feel what we've done is
3 taken advantage of the experience in other communities to
4 basically develop counter-measures against the problems that
5 may have plagued this kind of design when it was first tried
6 30 years ago, when bike lanes, themselves, were new.

7 So I think it's really time to, you know, test
8 some modern treatments and see if we can make something work
9 here that is, by all reports, quite a success in other
10 countries.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let's go with Mr.
12 Knowles.

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay. Since this isn't
14 on the street yet, and after our last discussion, what will
15 you be doing here in terms of collecting before data, as
16 opposed to just some observations, and until you can
17 categorize what success looks like with this design versus
18 other alternative designs?

19 MR. MILLER: That's probably a tougher issue to
20 answer. We do have concerns over general traffic
21 performance. I think that's something we're going to look
22 at. Some of the issues that I think we'll be looking at are
23 the potential for conflicts between vehicles and cyclists.

24 In New York motorists compliance with the left-
25 turn arrows has been somewhat of a problem. I don't think

1 that's going to be as much of a problem here in California,
2 but it really has to be proven.

3 As compared to the previous demonstration, I think
4 we're on a little bit different level here. A few have
5 already remarked if this was elevated six inches from the
6 street level it would be, for all intents and purposes, a
7 conventional type 3 facility -- type 1 facility.

8 What we're doing is basically asking for
9 permission to use those experimental devices necessary to do
10 this. And we felt, at the federal level, the most
11 significant thing we were asking for was the bicycle
12 indications.

13 And our interpretation was I don't think we would
14 have even need to have asked for that permission here to
15 have done this. However, we did need to -- you know, we do
16 know we need some wrong-way bicycle movement signs and
17 things like that in conjunction with this.

18 So, I don't think we're expecting a real failure
19 here. If we see a failure, it'll be because of something
20 obvious to us. But, you know, there is experience in this
21 treatment in New York City. They concluded it to be
22 positive. And we're aware of some other cities that have
23 also become interested in the New York experiment and some
24 interested in ours.

25 We were hoping to get this done before a few

1 blocks got implemented in Portland, but unfortunately, they
2 did theirs about three weeks ago. So we can't even say
3 we're number two anymore.

4 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: I want to add to that, because
5 that's a good question, is why are we doing it. We really
6 don't have a problem, per se, that we're trying to resolve
7 here, like you might in many of the other items that come
8 before the Committee.

9 What we're trying to do is reconfigure the mode
10 split in our downtown area. We do have transit. We have
11 seen a dramatic increase in residential units in our
12 downtown area.

13 And what we're trying to do here is see, if by
14 providing a better access via the bicycle and the facilities
15 that go with it, if we can change our mode split a little
16 bit.

17 If you look at this, we're giving up a travel
18 lane. We're giving up a travel lane in a congested downtown
19 area. That, in itself, is going to be quite an experiment
20 for us. So we'll see what the result --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: It was a travel lane
22 and not a parking lane?

23 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: Right. Right now, as a result
24 of this we're going to lose one of our three through-travel
25 lanes in that particular street. And the same on the

1 reverse loop that comes back. And we're going to have to
2 see how that turns out, you know, how the public adjusts to
3 it and what our traffic flows adjust.

4 You asked why we wouldn't put in a more
5 traditional type 1 bike facility. I need to be able to
6 reverse it quite rapidly. If this doesn't work, if this
7 experiment doesn't work, I can just remove the false curb,
8 removing the striping and put it all back the way I had it.

9 If I'm going to go into a huge capital investment
10 and put in permanent curb and a permanent -- you guys all
11 know what kind of costs I'd be talking about. And if it
12 failed, how would you go back to where you were.

13 So, we're kind of in an in-between stage. We want
14 to experiment. We think this is as close as we can get to
15 perhaps a true type 1 facility without going through the
16 physical expense, the infrastructure expense, to see if this
17 is going to work or not.

18 It may not work. We may come back here a year
19 from now and say it was a disaster both from our traffic
20 flow and bicycle usage may not appear. Then, again, it may
21 adjust. We may have great traffic flow and we may have a
22 lot of cyclists using this alternative mode, in which case
23 we might make something different.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: That is why I was
25 wondering what your alternatives were. I didn't hear

1 exactly why we went to the left, as opposed to park on the
2 left and have the class 1-ish area on the right.

3 Or, you know, the pros and cons of dedicating this
4 space or the separator at a very wide bike lane versus
5 getting away from the ten-foot through lanes. Because if a
6 bicycle is sharing a lane, it's now jammed in a ten-foot
7 lane adjacent to parked cars, as opposed to widening that
8 ten-foot lane so the bicycles could be more where motorists
9 expected them to be, have better visibility, and just go the
10 other way. You'd eliminate that lane, but use the remaining
11 pavement differently then.

12 MR. MILLER: A few comments --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- the pros and cons.

14 MR. MILLER: -- to that. It's up to the city to
15 ultimately weigh the loss of capacity versus the bike
16 facility.

17 What I can say, again back to New York experience,
18 which is somewhat shared in Long Beach, New York City did a
19 lot of left-side bike lanes in the traditional location.
20 They found they suffered a similar fate to right-side bike
21 lanes in many locations in New York City. Truck on-street
22 loading basically resulted in the lanes being blocked by
23 trucks the whole time. And one of the chief motivations for
24 this in New York City was to create a facility that would
25 not be subject to blockage by loading vehicles.

1 They still carry freight back and forth across the
2 bike way, but that's a lot less of an issue than to have a
3 vehicle parked in the bike lane, across the bicycles --
4 travel. I actually have some pictures of that happening.
5 Was in New York studying this before we did this.

6 There are a number of places that have done what I
7 would call conventional left-side bike lanes. Generally
8 speaking, they've been declared to be a success where it's a
9 college campus community, where there's a solid
10 understanding of bicycles versus cars.

11 They haven't been quite as much a success where
12 cycling is a little more intermittent because the motorists
13 haven't learned to look for bicycles yet. So, I think a
14 little bit more of a cautious approach to a left-side
15 facility probably is justified in this case.

16 There was a third comment that I've forgotten, but
17 we'll come back when I remember it.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But, you know, I talked
19 about the narrowing, but you covered that with the truck.
20 But now you could have done exactly the same thing by
21 putting the parking on the left and then the separation in
22 the bike way on the right, and had the bikes more in the
23 expected location.

24 MR. MILLER: That was the other point. I'm glad
25 you asked. The average speed of a transit vehicle and the

1 average speed of a bicycle are almost the exact same.
2 Although the bicycle moves very differently than the transit
3 vehicle, they basically could play this little leapfrog game
4 with each other.

5 If the facility is on the right side and the
6 transit vehicles still have to get over to their stops, we
7 would be really aggravating this leapfrog behavior with the
8 transit vehicle crossing the bike lane, and the bicycle
9 crossing the transit lane.

10 Long Beach Transit was very interested in this
11 project when we first started meeting in cities over it.
12 And they became very relieved when they understood the
13 wisdom that we picked up from New York, that they had moved
14 the facilities to the left side basically to avoid
15 interference with transit vehicles.

16 MR. ROSEMAN: Also in California generally we have
17 good compliance with drivers with left-turn indications. So
18 if you have a red left-turn arrow, generally you don't get a
19 lot of violations.

20 However, we have a number of right-turn red arrows
21 within the City of Long Beach and our compliance rate is
22 much lower. So if you had the bike facility on the right
23 side of the road, and you used a red right arrow to try to
24 get the vehicle not to turn in front of the bike, your
25 chance of having more conflicts is greater.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Dave, so all
2 these intersections have protected left-turn arrow?

3 MR. ROSEMAN: Through this project every single
4 one would.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And if it
6 doesn't, then you can see the potential instead of what they
7 call the right hook, now you have a problem with the left
8 hook, right?

9 MR. ROSEMAN: Well, that's what, to eliminate the
10 left hook would be the --

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: The protective --

12 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah, the protective left.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, is that utilizing
15 program visibility ahead so the vehicles can't see the bike
16 indication, and the bike can't see the vehicles --

17 MR. ROSEMAN: I think the details --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: -- they're very close
19 together.

20 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah, I think the details of that we
21 have not -- I don't think Rock and I have agreed to, exactly
22 how that's going to happen. Actually, my comments to Rock
23 recently, on the design, was that the signal head, itself,
24 needs to appear different. So we used black, like most
25 people do. Maybe we should consider using a yellow signal

1 head, along with a, you know, you see on other -- throughout
2 the country you will see, you know, left turn written on the
3 back plate. Or using a PV.

4 Because you're basically a few feet away from each
5 other.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Right.

7 MR. ROSEMAN: To make that PV work, it's not going
8 to work that well. And so I think we need to add some
9 different view to the bike indication so that it's not
10 confused with the vehicle indications.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Do you have any pictures
12 of what's there right now so you get a sense of the
13 character of the street or the neighborhood?

14 MR. MILLER: I probably have some. It would
15 probably take a few minutes to find one. But it's a
16 downtown three-lane street with parallel parking on both
17 sides.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: What about driveways?
19 Are there many driveways?

20 MR. MILLER: There's approximately one driveway
21 per block. Most of them are relatively low volume. The
22 highest volume driveway is a major parking structure that
23 has a signalized entrance.

24 But we do have driveways in every block, and we
25 have had to take precautions to make sure we have sight

1 distance preserved in those driveways.

2 MR. ROSEMAN: There's also some alleys, as well.
3 Every block has an alley.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any questions?
5 Seeing none, let's open the public hearing. Any members of
6 the public who wish to address the Committee on this part of
7 Long Beach's application? Mr. Shanteau.

8 DR. SHANTEAU: Yes. My name is Bob Shanteau,
9 California Association of Bicycling Organizations. I'm a
10 transportation engineer liaison for our group.

11 While we support Long Beach's attempts to increase
12 its cycling mode share downtown, we have a lot of heartburn
13 about how they're doing it. And we think it's based on a
14 total misunderstanding of how bicyclists operate in traffic.
15 Very simple. If they had read that "Street Smarts" book, I
16 don't think they would be here today.

17 The first problem we have is we don't think this
18 facility would be safe. Perhaps they've covered the
19 signalized intersections, but there are many intersections
20 that are not signalized. Just as Mr. Roseman just said,
21 they have a lot of alleys. One per block. Those are named
22 alleys, therefore, they're streets. And so you have cross-
23 streets every intersection that are unsignalized.

24 They said they'd provide sight distance. How can
25 you provide sight distance across a line of parked cars?

1 The drivers just don't expect to be turning across parked
2 cars, and then crossing another lane of traffic. And
3 bicycles are traffic.

4 Bicyclists are legitimate users of the road, so
5 says the Legislature, numerous times. Streets and highways
6 code, vehicle code, over and over again. The Legislature
7 has told us bicyclists are legitimate users of the roads.
8 Not to be shuffled off to the side.

9 The methods shown here are nonstandard,
10 nonstandard not only with the California Manual on Uniform
11 Traffic Control Devices, but nonstandard with the highway
12 design manual.

13 Unfortunately for the City of Long Beach, and
14 fortunately for every bicyclist in the state, the streets
15 and highways code the Legislature has seen fit to require
16 mandatory use of the bicycle portions of the highway design
17 manual for every local agency, including the City of Long
18 Beach.

19 So this experiment does not even comply with the
20 highway design manual. That's strictly against the law.
21 This is the California Traffic Control Devices Committee.
22 You can't do anything about that. That would have to go to
23 the California Bicycle Advisory Committee for action on any
24 experiments to changes to the highway design manual. That's
25 why the California Bicycle Advisory Committee was created.

1 It has a very similar makeup. It has representatives from
2 CSAC, it has representatives from the League of California
3 Cities, it has representatives from Triple A -- Mr. Bahadori
4 has been there. He's the southern California
5 representative.

6 California Bicycle Advisory Committee has a
7 representative from the California Highway Patrol, who in
8 the past two years has shown up for one and a half meetings.
9 It has a representative from Caltrans. He's our secretary.
10 He shows up for every meeting.

11 The California Bicycle Advisory Committee is where
12 decisions like this should be made.

13 To say that New York City is their model is, to
14 tell you the truth, how can they say New York City is
15 working when New York City does not even have an FHWA-
16 approved experiment going on? How do we know if it's
17 working or not? How do we know if the people, the officials
18 in New York City, who didn't even apply to federal highway
19 for approval, whether they're right or not? Whether they're
20 collecting the right data or not? We don't know.

21 We don't know how well it's working, because there
22 is no experimental procedure in New York City. So using New
23 York City as a model is totally incorrect.

24 Now, as far as calling this a bike lane, first of
25 all, it's not a bike lane. It's, at best, a bike path. But

1 it doesn't even meet the definition in the streets and
2 highways code of a bike path, because a bike path is in a
3 separate right-of-way. This is in the same right-of-way.
4 It's not a bike path either. So what is it? At best it's a
5 class 3 bike route. Okay.

6 Sure they say that bicycles will not be required
7 to use it. But can you imagine being a bicyclist trying to
8 use one of those two ten-foot lanes on this one-way street.

9 And yet there's this path a few feet away.

10 I've already had traffic engineers ask me on the
11 ITE traffic mailing list, why do bicyclists insist on using
12 the street when there's perfectly good path just a few feet
13 away, right next to it. And the answer is because it's not
14 a perfectly good path. It is dangerous. It keeps us
15 trapped between, if you go to another picture you'll see,
16 between two curbs, and leads us into trap after trap after
17 trap; at every driveway there's a trap.

18 We can't even make right turns without pulling
19 into the intersection, sideways, 90 degrees, and wait for
20 the green signal on the other side. Is that treating
21 bicyclists as operators of vehicles?

22 California vehicle code, 21200 says bicyclists
23 have all the rights and duties of the operators of vehicles.

24 Of vehicles. Not something else. Just because we want
25 more bicycles we're going to create another category of road

1 user. No. We know. There may be special rules for
2 bicyclists, like 21202, the far-to-the-right law, yes. But
3 there are exceptions to that, even.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Shanteau, if
5 you could summarize, please.

6 DR. SHANTEAU: I'm sorry, this is a major issue
7 for us.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I understand.

9 DR. SHANTEAU: I'm not going to be taking a long
10 time, but I do need to be given sufficient time --

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Sure, I
12 understand --

13 DR. SHANTEAU: -- to make our points.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- and I
15 appreciate if you summarize.

16 DR. SHANTEAU: I have -- we do -- presented a
17 letter to the CTCDC. And you should have it in front of
18 you. We made something like nine major points in that
19 letter.

20 This doesn't even follow the CVC, the California
21 vehicle code, because with the bicycle signals that they're
22 proposing don't meet the warrants in the California Manual
23 and Uniform Traffic Control devices. And the vehicle code
24 requires that bicycle signals meet those warrants.

25 That was set up actually for a particular

1 intersection in the City of Davis that has -- it's a "T"
2 intersection except for bicyclists. Bicyclists can continue
3 on past the "T". Yes, there are bicycle signal indications
4 at that intersection.

5 This application is for bicycle signal
6 indications. Now, it's not for bicycle signals. I mean a
7 bicycle signal would be all signals -- all bicycles, rather.

8 Well, neither is the one in Davis all bicycles.
9 There are cars that use the same intersection. It's a "T"
10 intersection for motorists and a four-way intersection for
11 bicyclists.

12 This one happens to have left-turn signals for the
13 what, for the motorists? No. For the left-turn lane, which
14 is a travel lane, which bicyclists can also use. And it has
15 bicycle signals.

16 Now, the vehicle code requires bicyclists to
17 follow the bicycle signal. What is a bicyclist, who is
18 using that left-turn lane, which signal does he or she
19 follow, the bicycle signal or the left-turn arrow?
20 Obviously, the left-turn arrow, but the vehicle code says
21 otherwise. That's a confusion that shouldn't even exist.

22 This experiment, in our opinion, should not even
23 happen. At very worst, this should be referred to the
24 California Bicycle Advisory Committee --

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, --

1 DR. SHANTEAU: -- for input into the California
2 Traffic Control Devices Committee.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you. We
4 have your extensive comments and all the items that you
5 mentioned in details. And I've looked at them, and I'm sure
6 the other members have read this. If not, I encourage you
7 to look at it, a very good letter. Thank you very much for
8 your comments.

9 DR. SHANTEAU: I would add one thing. It's an
10 impact analysis from ITE. It says all driveways should be
11 treated as intersections.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Perfect.
13 Thank you. Any other members? Steve.

14 MR. PYBURN: Steve Pyburn, Federal Highway
15 Administration. And I forgot to mention earlier that I have
16 to disclaimer all of my comments, that I may or may not have
17 the same opinion as our headquarters, who extensively
18 reviews the experiment request. So, if I say something that
19 disagrees with them, they should be -- the comments should
20 be considered together.

21 I echo the sentiments of bicycle safety. And as a
22 bicyclist, and as a traffic engineer, I have a number of
23 concerns with this experiment.

24 First, the driver expectation that bicyclists are
25 on the right still puts bicyclists at jeopardy because of

1 the attitude drivers have towards bicyclists. And the
2 common, or a fairly common attitude by drivers that
3 bicyclists don't belong in the road, left or right.

4 Bicyclists making a right turn across the through
5 movement is a concern. Visibility of bikes behind the
6 parked cars, specifically where left-turners are turning
7 into driveways, the alleys and the uncontrolled
8 intersections.

9 But also, as a car comes out of a driveway and has
10 to cross the bike path, then has to wait, has to creep out
11 between two parked cars and wait for a gap to turn into the
12 roadway. Their visibility is somewhat compromised and
13 they're going to block the bike lane at the same time while
14 they wait for that gap.

15 And I think, in a little different tack, the city
16 should -- may consider, or maybe has, the environmental
17 impact of losing the green time at the signal for the bike
18 signal, and losing the lane capacity and potential
19 environmental impacts.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you, sir.
21 The gentleman back there.

22 MR. COTA: Manny Cota, City of San Jose. I'm just
23 really interested. I do like their project, but I'm just a
24 little concerned on pedestrian access to and from the parked
25 vehicles adjacent to the bike lane. I'm not sure, I didn't

1 see anything addressed to that.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.

3 We'll take it as we'll have to address that like other
4 comments. Anyone else from the public who wishes to speak
5 on this item?

6 Seeing none, I close the public hearing, bringing
7 it back to the Committee. Before we get Rock or Mark,
8 either one, if you want to come to the podium, or maybe both
9 of you. Because some of them are staff, some of them are
10 technical.

11 Whose idea was it, and was the bicycling community
12 in Long Beach consulted on this before this was put on the
13 agenda for the Committee?

14 MR. MILLER: The bicycle community in Long Beach
15 is very active. And it represents all viewpoints. The city
16 does get input, such as the input Mr. Shanteau has given
17 you.

18 They also get a lot of input from a different
19 sector of the bicycle community that is basically loudly
20 telling the city we need more bikeway facilities. That
21 community does a pretty good job figuring out what's
22 happening around the rest of the country.

23 I don't find green lanes in Denver by myself. I
24 don't find bike lanes in a part of Manhattan I've never been
25 to, by myself. The bicycle community finds these things.

1 The bicycle community talks to each other about whether
2 they're working or not. And the bicycle community comes to
3 the city and says, look at what they've done in New York
4 City. We think that's very similar to downtown Long Beach.

5 And we really task the City of Long Beach to not say it
6 didn't work in 1970, it's not going to work now. But to
7 study examples like New York and help improve upon this.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, this was not
9 staff-generated? It was actually lobbied by the bicycle
10 community in Long Beach?

11 MR. MILLER: This was lobbied by the bicycle
12 community -- you may want to expand upon that.

13 MR. CHRISTOFFELS: In part, and in part it also
14 relates to my earlier discussion with you about us looking
15 at our general plan, and the downtown configuration, the
16 population shifts, the modal split shift, all of those
17 things happening. And we're kind of looking out forward as
18 to where we're going to go.

19 Like I said, I got mass transit in downtown. We
20 were one of the first cities to actually have a bike station
21 in downtown, where you actually come in and drop off your
22 bike like you would at a parking structure and go off
23 somewhere.

24 And so we're seeing all this activity. And then
25 it was the impetus for, well, maybe this is something we

1 need to take a hard look at and experiment with, and see if
2 it works or doesn't work.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Mr.
4 Babico.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: What's the percent of
6 the bicyclists versus the other users?

7 MR. MILLER: Well, it's never been measured on a
8 citywide basis, but slightly higher than average.
9 Communities are getting about 1 percent to 1.5 percent
10 cycling.

11 Areas of Long Beach, including the downtown and
12 the previous area, are in excess of that in my judgment.
13 We've got, you know, mode split along an individual
14 corridor, but as you've heard before, the goal is to get
15 that to a much higher number. You hear 5 percent of all
16 trips, or 20 percent of all short trips.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, here previously
18 you mentioned the ADT is 40,000.

19 MR. MILLER: That's not this street. This
20 street's considerably lower than that. It's probably on the
21 order of 15,000 --

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Are we talking 10
23 percent bicycles?

24 MR. MILLER: I think it would be the goal to get
25 it to 10 percent. It's probably -- well, this street's not

1 very comfortable for cyclists. Cyclists would probably use
2 a parallel street rather than use this street at this time.

3 What I can tell you is at least for the short term
4 future we did do a full traffic analysis for this project.
5 We have determined that under normal everyday traffic
6 conditions, the level of service will remain good on these
7 streets.

8 It's not really different than the streets outside
9 of the building here. You have downtown streets that were
10 laid out many many years ago with a whole lot of one-way
11 lanes. And people just go out there and say, I don't think
12 this street really needs three or four lanes. I think it
13 could probably work with one less lane.

14 And a lot of, you know, older downtowns with the
15 three to four lanes in each direction, I think will make the
16 same finding as Long Beach has.

17 Future future future forecasts for this area say,
18 you know, the volumes could go way up, and that it might be
19 a mistake to lose the third lane. But as Mark has
20 suggested, he would have the ability to put it back if he
21 ever had to.

22 Other future forecasts say that, you know, maybe
23 bicycling will rise much more to the point where it does
24 make sense to put a larger percentage of our infrastructure
25 into bicycle facilities and perhaps move vehicles the other

1 way.

2 Mark did mention the L.A./Long Beach light rail
3 line also serves downtown Long Beach. And cyclists have a
4 very strong interaction with that facility.

5 And I personally have no doubt that if cycling is
6 going to rise to become a much more substantial share of the
7 modes, it's going to be in areas like downtown Long Beach
8 that you're going to see it first.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Other
10 members? This side, Mr. Fisher.

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I was just
12 going to say that if I had real safety concerns about this I
13 wouldn't be inclined to approve the experiment. But there's
14 nothing inherently unsafe that I see.

15 It's been brought up that this is different. The
16 design manual doesn't show this. It's been brought up that
17 there are driveways, there are alleys. There are possible
18 conflicts between the parked motorists who's walking towards
19 the sidewalk coming in conflict with the bicyclists. I
20 think we recognize all these.

21 But I think we are getting a lot of pressure to
22 try things that have been, at least, perceived as successful
23 elsewhere in the country. We're getting a lot of pressure
24 to try things to provide a more bicycle-friendly
25 environment. And I think we need to use the opportunity of

1 experiments to tell us whether this is transferrable to
2 other locations, or whether this really is a flap. I don't
3 think we're going to know that unless we conduct the
4 experiment.

5 So I'd be inclined to approve the experiment,
6 recognizing that there could be some safety issues that
7 emerge that aren't evident to me right now.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Members. On the
9 bicycle stuff, you know, I just -- I really don't know
10 bicycling, period. I don't ride bicycles mixed with
11 traffic. So I have to listen to people who understand what
12 it takes, you know. Wayne is a bicycle rider, Bob is a
13 bicycle rider.

14 And in terms of organizational reliance, there is
15 a bicycle advisory committee that Caltrans has. And the
16 reason I ask you where this whole idea comes from, if it's a
17 city staff idea without input from the bicycle community, I
18 feel a little uncomfortable supporting something without
19 hearing from the people who are actually system users.

20 And that's why -- I think Mark just left -- Mark
21 said that the bicycle community in Long Beach has been
22 consulted and they have apparently a different view from Mr.
23 Shanteau, and they feel comfortable with the experiment.

24 But, in general organization, I mean that's my
25 thinking, where I'm going.

1 Anybody else? Mr. Knowles.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, especially if
3 their study will include the 11 points spread out in their
4 document, in terms of all that before and after data. And I
5 think you were right on in terms of, you know, when I think
6 of New York City, having been there, or even downtown Los
7 Angeles, I think of loading and unloading of trucks. And
8 how often that is in the way.

9 And then I run a transit system, so, of course,
10 the right side would interfere with those buses. And this
11 isn't the first time it's been done on the left. My first
12 impulse would be to say no, but, you know, I know that in
13 surveying 4500 employees in Santa Barbara County about why
14 they didn't use different mode splits, the average person,
15 not maybe the average avid cyclist, but they don't like
16 sharing the road really. They really prefer separated
17 paths.

18 And this is about creating mode shift, that's part
19 of a greener planet, you know, the whole thing. And so if
20 you can actually increase bicycle use, and you're tracking
21 before and after volumes, and before and after collision
22 data, and conflicts, it seems like a worthwhile test if
23 you're gathering all that data.

24 And you're already agreeing to remove this after
25 the test. So I would support this.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Ms. Wong.

2 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: There's a motion.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, there was no
4 motion --

5 MR. SPEAKER: No motion yet.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, no, he just
7 -- Mr. Fisher just expressed his support. He didn't make a
8 motion. His ideas. Ms. Wong?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: I am a cyclist and I do
10 cycle in -- I do tend to ride on roads that have separated
11 or marked lanes. The left lane is a little strange to me.
12 And this picture doesn't show vehicles being on the right
13 side of the stripe, where there may be visibility issues.
14 So that would be my concern, as a cyclist.

15 But I do like separated -- I would be inclined to
16 support an experiment.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: With that, any
18 feedback from the bicycle advisory committee at this time?

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Well, I -- yeah --

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I'm just --
21 Chief?

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I think that if there's
23 a process that's supposed to be followed, and one of the
24 steps is that it goes before the bicyclist advisory
25 committee, I think that needs to happen.

1 I think I'm feeling a little bit backed into a
2 corner with the last experiment we talked about. It's
3 already painted, it's already there, it's already going.
4 And if there is at least an attempt to go about this the way
5 it's supposed to happen, then I think it should happen the
6 way it's supposed to happen. And send it to the committee
7 for review and for input.

8 I have some concerns about the safety of it. I'm
9 not so sure about -- I have the same concerns that were
10 brought up before. Vehicles trying to enter, crossing that
11 bike lane, blocking the bike lane trying to get out in the
12 traffic, trying to do that between the parked cars. I have
13 all those same concerns.

14 And I'm also just kind of wondering, so why was
15 this particular section of roadway picked for this
16 experiment. It talks about we're going to gather before and
17 after data, but if you're really trying to gauge how
18 effective something is, shouldn't you put it someplace where
19 you've identified a problem? Shouldn't we already have some
20 of that before data to begin with to determine where we're
21 going to put it? Not just because we happen to have a road
22 that's wide enough to accommodate it.

23 So, those are my thoughts.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Henley.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Well, you know, you do

1 an experiment to answer questions. And one of the reasons
2 we like to run this stuff by CBAC is because they'll raise
3 the questions. And I'd hate to have to come back to this
4 Committee two years from now, and then all of a sudden --
5 because I'll tell you, when it comes back in two years or
6 however many years it comes back, then CBAC is going to have
7 their questions. And hopefully, you know, the questions
8 have been answered so that we don't have to go back and
9 experiment some more.

10 So I really, you know, I encourage running it by
11 CBAC before we really go down the road too far on this.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Fisher.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: It's been my
14 experience with our own bicycle advisory committee in the
15 City of Los Angeles, our pedestrian and bicycle -- or
16 pedestrian advisory committee, and such. As well as those
17 who speak for the blind and the handicapped, that you're
18 going to hear a wide variety of perspectives. And you're
19 going to hear different points of view. And I don't think
20 that what you're going to hear unanimity.

21 So I think if they've gone through their process
22 where they've heard from their bicycle advisory committee,
23 they've heard all those perspectives. And that community is
24 very interconnected with those throughout the state and
25 throughout the nation. And I think whatever concerns have

1 been raised among themselves have been presented to us.

2 My second comment on the State Bicycle Advisory
3 Committee is that's not part of our process. We are
4 authorized to approve experiments. And so, I don't know how
5 that ties in with this. I don't think we should be bound by
6 another committee that reports to Caltrans, but doesn't
7 interact with us.

8 But my understanding is that this committee is
9 authorized to approve experiments for traffic control
10 devices. And perhaps if we were to come to a recommendation
11 that we develop a new traffic control device that's related
12 to bicycles, I would think you'd want to take that to the
13 bicycle advisory committee. But we have no recommendation
14 to them. We're just considering allowing an experiment. We
15 don't know where that's going to lead.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Presleigh.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: You know, I'm going
18 with John Fisher.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: I think it's an
21 opportunity to see how this works out here. We've done some
22 experimentations in Santa Cruz County where we had some
23 loss, the sea cliffs. And, you know, we're now getting into
24 some unique designs, but trying to be consistent with the
25 highway design manual. You can't always be; that's the

1 problem.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yes.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: So I would recommend
4 that we consider this experiment.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Just a
6 couple -- a comment, and then a question for Dave Roseman.

7 On the highway design manual, the highway design
8 manual is not a state law. It's only a Caltrans document.
9 Except chapter 1000, which has exception in the state law,
10 about chapter 1000 for bicycle facilities.

11 The rest of the highway design manual, nobody in
12 California is obligated to follow that, period. It's a
13 Caltrans document.

14 A lot of people decide to do that, a lot of cities
15 and the counties, because it's a very good document. It's a
16 very well developed document. But there is nothing in the
17 state law that says that cities and the counties must follow
18 Caltrans highway design manual.

19 But it is the state law that they must follow
20 California manual, I mean for traffic control devices. So
21 there is a difference. And this one supersedes the highway
22 design manual. Chapter 1000 has exceptions.

23 Having said that, I need to really ask Mr.
24 Roseman, if you can come to the podium, what level of
25 involvement -- was this like you called a couple bicycle

1 people that you knew in the city? Or you have a bicycle
2 advisory committee? Or there is a Long Beach bicycle
3 coalition? Who did you consult with when you developed the
4 experiment from the bicycle community?

5 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah, this has been probably, I'd
6 say, a two-year process. This is one of the projects that's
7 come out of about a two-year process in which the city has
8 engaged the bicycle community and has created a group that
9 meets regularly to talk about bicycle issues.

10 We've had numerous community meetings on bicycle
11 issues. I would say probably on the order of 20, I would
12 think, over the last year, yeah. And not everybody's on the
13 -- just like John said, not everybody has the same opinion.
14 But there's a pretty strong grouping that feels that this
15 type of experiment is worthy.

16 Because of that perception, I think Mark mentioned
17 it, a lot of people perceive that they would cycle if they
18 had a protected bike way.

19 Personally, I don't know if that's going to be the
20 case. I'm not sure. This may sit empty. But that's part,
21 in my opinion that's one of the biggest experiments, is
22 something like this going to attract cyclists.

23 And, you know, the indication, all the way from
24 the city manager on down, as well as with the bicycle side,
25 there's an overwhelming support for this type of a project.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: But there has
2 been an ongoing comprehensive collaboration --

3 MR. ROSEMAN: Yeah, for --

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- with the
5 bicycle community in Long Beach --

6 MR. ROSEMAN: For at least two years.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: For at least two
8 years, okay. Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Roseman?
9 None. Okay.

10 Okay, what's your pleasure? Do we have a motion
11 now, or do you want to further discuss, then make a motion?

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I move
13 approval of this component of their proposal.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There is a motion
15 to approve.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I second that.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And there is a
18 second. There is a motion and a second. Discussion on the
19 motion?

20 Seeing none, all those in favor?

21 (Ayes.)

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Opposition?
23 Seeing none, the motion passes.

24 Okay. They have another -- yeah, there's a third
25 part now. I was going to do the third part. We should have

1 called today's Long Beach's special meeting.

2 MR. ROSEMAN: Unfortunately, Mark is catching me a
3 cab and I've got to run, so we're going to leave it to Rock
4 here to do that.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

6 MR. ROSEMAN: So, I hope that he'll get the advice
7 from you and we can move forward on that project.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: As long as he has
9 the authority to speak on behalf of the City of Long Beach.

10 MR. ROSEMAN: At this point, yes.

11 (Laughter.)

12 MR. MILLER: I have trouble committing large
13 expenses on behalf to the city, but I think I can make
14 commitments that they would honor.

15 I think I gave the presentation before. We're
16 really asking for the Committee basically to indicate with
17 that given and the thought that number three lane's not
18 necessary, would this be an acceptable form of striping
19 within the description and guidelines of the MUTCD as it
20 reads now.

21 And if not, what would the city want to do in
22 order to move forward with finding a way of taking advantage
23 of this width.

24 And one potential alternative was this treatment
25 that, again, we found in New York City, that doesn't like to

1 apply for standards.

2 I'm not even sure which way the city wants to go.

3 I know that the city just wants to take advantage of doing
4 something in this space that they feel is not necessary for
5 motorists. And I think we're looking for a path of most
6 logic and least resistance toward how to get there.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Questions for Mr.
8 Miller. Mr. Babico.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: The previous slide, the
10 same question regarding that five-foot striped lane. Is
11 that the same answer?

12 MR. MILLER: Eleven feet from the curb to the --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Five foot.

14 MR. MILLER: Five-foot buffer between the travel
15 lane and the bicycle lane. So there would be five feet of
16 space that technically the way the street is striped, nobody
17 would have a clear purpose to use, other than vehicles that
18 are crossing the stripes to reach the parking lane.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Thank you.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Fisher.

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Well, again,
22 the correspondence that I got, I thought one of the drawings
23 showed cross-hatch in the buffer area. Is that part of your
24 proposal or has that been dropped?

25 MR. MILLER: You did see something from the city

1 on that. The city has applied cross-hatch for some
2 conditions that look like this. But where the city has done
3 it, it was clear to their intent that vehicles not cross the
4 cross-hatching to get into the parking space.

5 And I believe the city and we have kind of come to
6 the agreement that that would not be a striping treatment
7 which would conduce what we're looking for.

8 We're truly looking for something that would tell
9 cyclists the best place to ride, and would tell motorists
10 that it's still okay to cross all lines to get into a
11 parking space.

12 Clearly, I think John's referring to, there was
13 kind of a diagonal ladder striping going through this area.

14 And where they've done that there was room for a vehicle to
15 travel between the diagonal stripe and the curb.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I guess
17 actually it would have to be a chevron to point people in
18 the right direction.

19 MR. MILLER: Yes, I don't remember if it was a
20 chevron or a diagonal, but it was something that we kind of
21 discovered when we were looking around trying to find where
22 things like this had been done.

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: My only
24 comment on that is that in everything we do, two solid lines
25 constitutes a painted island. And that's the treatment we

1 use for -- and for painted islands where we don't have a
2 raised island. And that could be perceived then as not
3 allowing one to really get access to the parking lane.

4 So, to me, I understand why there's a desire to do
5 it, but just in my opinion it seems like there's a painted
6 island there. That doesn't allow one to traverse it.

7 In fact, I think in the vehicle code there's some
8 provision that says parallel lines separated by I think at
9 least --

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Four feet.

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: -- two feet?

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Four feet.

13 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Well, okay. I
14 thought it said two feet of separation.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Painted median.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Okay.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And then it --

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: That
19 constitutes a painted island. And that's kind of what that
20 looks like.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: But doesn't specify for
22 painted islands. It should be yellow, not white.

23 (Parties speaking simultaneously.)

24 MR. MILLER: This one clearly has to be white.

25 The yellow would constitute --

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, I'm saying painted
2 island.

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: You can have a
4 separation island as opposed to a median island.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, but that is
6 probably for channelization. But painted medians always is
7 yellow.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Knowles.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: As I recall, picturing
10 it in my mind, within the MUTCD and the bicycle striping
11 standard, there are times when we have two parallel six-inch
12 white lines, whether it's to the left of a right-turn pocket
13 that might be a couple hundred feet long after we've done
14 the dash transition over. There's other places where we use
15 to solid white lines side-by-side, and it's not considered
16 an unbreakable barrier. And they are more than two feet
17 apart, and they are solid.

18 MR. PYBURN: Those are mainly --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, but how's it --

20 MR. PYBURN: That's not a lane --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I know, but it looks
22 the same to Joe Blow Motorist, you know. So I'm assuming
23 you're saying we're looking at two six-inch white stripes,
24 and then a four-inch edge stripe?

25 MR. MILLER: It would be two six-inch stripes,

1 which, as you've indicated, would be very similar to a
2 treatment that does appear in the bike way striping
3 standards for a lane adjacent to parking, which is commonly
4 used when the cars don't park there very often.

5 What we're basically proposing to do is to do that
6 treatment and then add to it basically an edge line to
7 delineate the right edge of the travel lane.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'm quite sure, John,
9 there's other places where we do have those parallel solid
10 white lines, and you can cross them. You can change lanes
11 over them, it's not prohibited.

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Are you
13 saying --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Oh, he's saying -- you
15 can cross them.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Are you
17 saying --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Discourage you to cross
19 them.

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Are you saying
21 the example where let's say we didn't have that last line,
22 the left-most line.

23 MR. SPEAKER: Right.

24 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: That we have
25 the six-inch bike lane line, and the four-inch edge line?

1 Is that what you're referring to?

2 MR. MILLER: I don't think I've seen that. There
3 are many places where there are two six-inch lines
4 approximately five to six feet apart. The inner line,
5 buffering from the parked cars; and the outer line providing
6 delineation between the bicyclists and the travel lane.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: The inner line
8 is six inches.

9 MR. MILLER: They're both bike stripes. And
10 that's very clearly shown in the bike standards.

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I thought it
12 had to be four, as an edge --

13 MR. MILLER: I will defer to Mr. Shanteau if he's
14 positive about that. What I do know is that it is
15 definitely acceptable to have two white lines bordering
16 either side of a bike lane, pretty much unconditionally.
17 And there are many examples of striping treatments to show
18 that in the bike lane manuals -- bike lane chapter.

19 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: So there's
20 nothing to address what happens when you add a third white
21 line --

22 (Laughter.)

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: It doesn't --

24 MR. MILLER: The issue is whether we can add the
25 four-inch edge line to a treatment that is already shown in

1 the manual, if we have more space than --

2 DR. SHANTEAU: It's going to be --

3 MR. MILLER: Six-inch --

4 DR. SHANTEAU: Four-inch.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. I don't
6 think you're going to settle that question.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, are there any
8 signs that go with this?

9 MR. MILLER: I don't believe any signage is
10 necessary other than bike way signage. We don't see it's a
11 major issue. We really see it as we'd like to find a way to
12 treat this. And we can't come up with a way that seems like
13 it's an optimal treatment.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: And are there parking T
15 marks in the parking lane? I know in Santa Barbara where I
16 had a lot of retirees, I'd have right-turners sometime in
17 the curb-side lane, you know, until they ran into the back
18 of a parked car.

19 MR. MILLER: There don't happen to be parking Ts
20 here, but I think the city would entertain putting them in
21 if, in the end, we felt that that was a counter stripe to
22 say yes, it's okay to park here.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I mean bars close at
24 2:00 in the morning, you got 11-foot side lane.

25 MR. MILLER: Well, there's all kinds of signs that

1 say two-hour parking, so the signs would suggest that it is
2 a parking zone.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I don't know about
4 that.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: The idea of a
6 parking T might be a good one to look into.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Yeah, I think so.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other
9 questions, comments?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: What do you hope to gain
11 with that extra, you know, the four-inch edge stripe?

12 MR. MILLER: One of the things we're a little bit
13 nervous about is I'm sure a lot of you are aware that there
14 was a really difficult settlement involving a lawsuit in my
15 area of Orange County, where a vehicle was driving in a
16 extra wide bike lane and crashed into some joggers.

17 And although I don't see why that settled that
18 way. I think the city and other cities are a little bit
19 nervous about putting in wider bicycle lanes simply because
20 there's this \$4- to \$5 million adverse experience out there
21 that we're all a little bit nervous about.

22 So, we're kind of looking for a tool that isn't
23 going to allow a driver to say I thought it was a travel
24 lane.

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: You're talking

1 about the accident in Dana Point?

2 MR. MILLER: That's the one.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Any other
4 comments, questions? Okay. Did I open public hearing on
5 this? I didn't --

6 MR. SPEAKER: You're not asking -- asking comment.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, but still
8 it's -- experimentation. Anybody who wishes to address the
9 Committee on this agenda item? So give a chance to address
10 the agenda item.

11 Mr. Shanteau, and I'd appreciate it if you'd keep
12 your comments to five minutes.

13 DR. SHANTEAU: My name is Bob Shanteau, California
14 Association of Bicycling Organizations. We represent
15 California bicyclists.

16 We'd like to point out 21651 vehicle code.
17 Whenever a highway has been divided into two or more
18 roadways -- that's not the right section, not the right
19 portion, is it --

20 MR. PYBURN: You have to keep reading, it --

21 DR. SHANTEAU: Is it? Okay. -- has been divided
22 into two or more roadways by means of intermittent barriers,
23 or by means of a dividing section of not less than two feet
24 in width, either unpaved or delineated by curbs, double
25 parallel lines or other markings on the roadway, it is

1 unlawful to do either the following: To drive any vehicle
2 over, upon or across the dividing section.

3 Plain language, the vehicle code, that five-foot
4 portion is a painted island. And it divides the highway
5 into two roadways. The two travel lanes on the left, and
6 the bike lane and the parking lane on the right. Simple.
7 Doesn't get much more complicated than that.

8 The other thing is why have the buffer at all, the
9 five-foot buffer at all? Why not move it over to the right,
10 put the bike lane on the left, next to the travel lane, like
11 a conventional bike lane. That was experimented with in the
12 1960s and '70s. And written into the California highway
13 design manual and the California Manual and Uniform Traffic
14 Control devices, and the Federal Manual and Uniform Traffic
15 Control devices, and the AASHTO guide for development of
16 bicycle facilities. They all say put the bike lane next to
17 the travel lane. This is not a bike lane. It's a separate
18 roadway.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, thank you.

20 DR. SHANTEAU: Oppose the experiment.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you.

22 DR. SHANTEAU: Or refer it to CBAC.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other members
24 of the public who wishes to address the Committee on this
25 issue? Ms. Wells.

1 MS. WELLS: I have to talk at least once. Laura
2 Wells, San Jose. All of the experiments proposed by Long
3 Beach are real exciting to us, because as -- I'm sorry, I
4 forgot, I had lunch with you and I don't remember your name.

5 MR. MILLER: Rock Miller.

6 MS. WELLS: Rock Miller pointed out, Fourth Street
7 right outside here is extremely wide. It was built for
8 cars. We're also trying to establish a mode shift. And see
9 one of the ways of doing that is putting in a protected type
10 bike lane.

11 The thing that I would propose maybe considering
12 on here is putting in some sort of striped chevron
13 treatment. And if there's any way to have a dashed line --
14 if that gets you around the crossing two solid lines that's
15 not allowed -- if you dash it with some sort of either
16 coloring or chevron striping, does that help? Just a
17 comment.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thanks. Anyone
19 else? Okay, seeing none I close the public comment on this
20 item. Bring it back to the Committee. Mr. Knowles.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I'd still simply like
22 to emphasize that I hear what's being read about two
23 parallel solid white lines. However, it's very standard to
24 have two parallel solid lines between the traveling through-
25 traffic lane and the parking lane. It's a standard. It's

1 used all over. And I've never heard of a citation for a
2 vehicle traveling over two solid white parallel lines that
3 are more than two feet across to get to the parking lane.
4 We do it all the time.

5 And for me, I think the chevrons make it look like
6 even more of a barrier, whereas an edge stripe, and I
7 completely understand the need to narrow it, so I'm all for
8 the edge stripe. I'm all for the buffer. I'm all for the
9 experiment. It looks like win/win/win. And one bicyclist
10 passes the other using the buffered area, which kind of is a
11 no-man's land, I don't see any problem with that. It's no
12 worse than simply putting the bike lane adjacent to the
13 travel lane.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So you actually
15 went to the name for buffer, now it's the bicycle passes --

16 (Laughter.)

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But for cyclists that
18 are more recreational or less professional, they like having
19 the separation.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Bhullar, you
21 put something up. Do you want to share something with the
22 Committee?

23 MR. BHULLAR: I'm just trying to show the line I
24 think Jeff is referring to in the California MUTCD. It says
25 the bottom standard there, where crossing the lane line

1 marking is prohibited. The lane line marking shall consist
2 of two normal solid white lines.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Does it specify the
4 color?

5 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah, all in white.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Solid white?

7 MR. BHULLAR: Yeah, right there.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Is permitted.

9 (Parties speaking simultaneously.)

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, it says where
11 crossing the lane line is prohibited.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Two solid white can
13 be -- is permitted to --

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, it's not
15 permitted.

16 MR. BHULLAR: Okay, let's go through in sequence.

17 Basically what it says is up there, when it is permitted
18 the lane line marking shall consist of a normal broken white
19 line. When it is discouraged then it becomes solid.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay, so it's not
21 prohibited. It's discouraged.

22 MR. BHULLAR: Okay, but, no -- but that's one.
23 And then when it's prohibited, then it's two.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Then how do we go
25 across two solid white lines say from the travel lanes

1 across the bike lane and over to the parking lane?

2 MR. BHULLAR: Right here. This one prohibits you
3 from --

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, how come you can
5 cross a double yellow provided --

6 MR. BHULLAR: This is just talking about the
7 white.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: What's the difference?

9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: It's not two feet
10 apart. Double yellow is not two feet apart. It's only --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Does it say two feet
12 apart?

13 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Consists of two --

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Solid line. It doesn't
15 say two feet.

16 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: It says consists of
17 two --

18 MR. BHULLAR: But that section talks about more
19 than two feet.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let's go to Mr.
21 Fisher. Mr. Fisher.

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: One of the
23 operative words there is normal. Does normal generally mean
24 four-inch line? That's a question for Johnny. Shall
25 consist of two normal solid white lines. To us, does normal

1 mean four-inch or eight-inch or six-inch, or what?

2 MR. BHULLAR: The normal lines that are used in
3 the details in chapter 3 here, they are four-inch lines. So
4 a normal line is a four-inch line, whether it's solid,
5 broken or solid. Whether it's two or one.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Well, then in their
7 experiment there's only one normal lines.

8 MR. BHULLAR: It depends upon your definition of
9 normal.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: We shouldn't even
11 have language like that in the manual. When we do clean-up
12 next time, we need to clean that up.

13 MR. BHULLAR: No, that is --

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It's a technical
15 document, you just say normal line.

16 MR. BHULLAR: -- in black text and shall, so we'll
17 have to have Steve Pyburn -- no, he left already -- so
18 that's imposed upon us by the feds.

19 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Engineering
20 documents don't say normal. We don't have anything that's
21 normal line. You have to say four-inch, six-inch,
22 perpendicular.

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I thought
24 Laura Wells had an interesting thought, maybe that would be
25 to break an outer line.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Well, I thought
2 about that, but it makes it probably more confusing because
3 as soon as you see a broken white line, a white line, you
4 think this is a travel lane. So, you just --

5 (Parties speaking simultaneously.)

6 MR. BHULLAR: That's an interesting question.
7 Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. Let me show you then, in that
8 case, what we already have for bicycles. From 100 to 200
9 feet in advance we do break the solid. So let me show you
10 those figures, because sometimes showing the figure that we
11 have on the books might --

12 See here, for example, they are the ones --

13 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No, but adjacent to a
14 right-turn-only lane.

15 MR. BHULLAR: And then this one is again showing
16 parking and a solid line here.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But the double solid to
18 the left side. You got two parallel lines, white lines,
19 solid, more than two feet apart.

20 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: And then you have a
21 shorter --

22 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: But is that
23 because the vehicle code specifically says that you may
24 cross a six-inch bike lane line to enter parking? So maybe
25 the vehicle code provides an exception for that.

1 MR. BHULLAR: I don't know.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: But, I mean, does that
3 mean that if we use two four-inch and one -- I mean, is
4 there a way to break the pattern so it's not two six-inch
5 lines? I mean you're saying the six-inch has exceptions.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: That line
7 shows --

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, if there is
9 a driveway there, you can cross those lines --

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Right.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- and get into
12 the driveway.

13 So if we change it to six-inch it's going to solve
14 the problem?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No. There's two six-
16 inch which you can cross, and there's only one four-inch.
17 There's not a two-inch and four-inch. There's only one --

18 MR. SPEAKER: A six and a four.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: But they're also
20 described as normal solid white lines.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Is the bike lane
22 abnormal?

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, guys, if
24 you can't settle the issue we have to do something, either
25 table it or have them come back with a clarification. I

1 hate for them to be -- if the pleasure of the Committee is
2 to approve the experiment, I hate for them to come back on
3 such a minor thing. They can clarify.

4 But if you do it, if you have a problem with the
5 whole experiment, itself, then the whole thing is tabled.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: This is not
7 part of the experiment.

8 MR. SPEAKER: This is not experiment, no.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: This is just
10 they wanted our opinion on it.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So you're not
12 asking to experiment on this?

13 MR. MILLER: We're asking if what we're thinking
14 of doing originally, the three lines, complies with
15 standards. You all have somewhat disagreed. And we have
16 somewhat come to the same conclusion. And we felt that
17 taking it to the official body we could get an official
18 answer from that.

19 We also felt that while there is a need for
20 something like this to be allowed, because there's a lot of
21 places where we think it confused, and if it does require an
22 official action, we'd like to know how to get it started.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Well, I think on
24 the first -- I think on the question of application, this is
25 not a normal treatment of a bike lane. So probably you need

1 to get experimentation request put in place like the other
2 two that you have.

3 But in terms of whether we even want to support it
4 or not, do you even think it's a good thing for the city to
5 pursue? Mr. Babico.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: But the whole thing
7 under this item is under experimentation.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, but they're
9 asking if we think they should come back with a request for
10 experimentation.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Their request is --

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, at this time
13 they are not requesting.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: -- under experimentation
15 for --

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: They are just
17 asking our opinion.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: -- two separate requests
19 from the city?

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Three separate
21 requests --

22 (Parties speaking simultaneously.)

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I assume, as they have
24 one item with three components --

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah. You're

1 right. Two of them are requests for experimentation; one is
2 advisory.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: What it says here is
4 that two of them are experimentation and the last one is
5 whatever it is. I don't see that.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's the
7 Windows' fault.

8 MR. BHULLAR: It just broke down during the
9 presentation. Before it was one item, but they had the
10 three different numbers --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: This is then, is what?

12 MR. BHULLAR: This one they're asking an opinion,
13 the Committee's opinion. The Committee's advice, if they
14 can do that.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Then shouldn't we bring
16 it back as an action item?

17 MR. BHULLAR: It's up to them. It's up to them if
18 they want --

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, it's up to the
20 panel, to the Committee.

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: No, but they
22 didn't ask to experiment with it. They just asked for our
23 opinion at this point in time.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Then we shouldn't vote,
25 we shouldn't do anything, right?

1 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: No one asked for a
2 vote yet.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I haven't asked
4 for a vote. I'm just asking what is your opinion about
5 this? Do you think it's a good item worthy for the city to
6 further pursue? Do you think it's a good idea?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, my understanding
8 is they're asking if we were to stripe it this way, would it
9 conform with the California MUTCD, or would it be an
10 experiment that we need permission for.

11 To me, it's a standard two-stripe bike lane with
12 an edge stripe. I like the buffer.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Ms. Wong?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: I like the idea. I don't
15 know if it's standard or not standard.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Chief?

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Same. I like the idea,
18 but the technicality is with the width of the stripes.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I like the idea. Again,
20 there's some technicalities that beyond me at this point.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: What do you mean,
22 you're a Caltrans. You're supposed to --

23 (Laughter.)

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Fisher.

25 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I think the

1 idea has merit. For example, if you didn't have parking
2 next to the curb, and you wanted to provide a buffer between
3 the vehicular travel lane and the bike lane, I don't think
4 there would be any issue of having a buffer there.

5 So I think a buffer has its place where you don't
6 need to get to the curb to get to parking, where parking is
7 prohibited. So I think a buffer can have its place.

8 I think it becomes a more difficult issue if you
9 say, well, does that buffer allow you to cross it if you
10 have parking on this side.

11 So if we were to use this striping, but we didn't
12 allow parking, it would be very clear it's a buffered lane
13 and vehicles cannot go over it. And now that we introduce
14 the element of parking, I think we're giving a very mixed
15 message.

16 And so, even though we can't completely resolve
17 with one unanimous voice if this is legal or not, I think
18 all of us disagree to a degree, I think we can all agree
19 that it is not clear what is intended.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Presleigh.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: You know, I've worked
22 in big cities and small little counties, and, you know,
23 there's times like this where that would really work well
24 for some of the roads that have been described in the past.

25 And I think there's an opportunity here to provide a

1 buffer.

2 And I want to get past the MUTCD, make sure it's
3 legal and all that. But I think there's opportunities. And
4 I would be open to looking at it in the future.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I think, yeah, I
6 think the concept is a good one. I don't think it's a
7 standard. I don't think it's authorized. Because the
8 minute you say that, then everybody can start put a buffer,
9 and people are going to have a two-foot buffer, three-foot
10 buffer, six-foot buffer, seven-foot buffer.

11 They're going to put four-inch line, six-inch
12 line. And then we're going to get into like if the idea is
13 -- the idea of a class 2 bike lane mark is that there is a
14 bike lane and there's a travel lane. There's no separation.

15 If you're going to introduce a separation as a
16 standard treatment, which I think is good where we have the
17 room, we have to do it, it makes it safer. There's no
18 question. You don't even need to be a traffic engineer to
19 know that much.

20 But if you want to do that then I think we have to
21 do it in a standard way. That you need to set a minimum
22 buffer width. We need to in line with the standard. And
23 so, for those reasons, I don't think it's included in MUTCD.

24 Mr. Knowles.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, I mean we're

1 dealing with the third line, so. And I understand their
2 question completely. I mean they'd rather ask permission in
3 this case than to do it and say I'm sorry instead.

4 I mean if they were using Bott's dots instead of a
5 line for the third line, would this issue go away? If they
6 were just putting a Bott dot, white Bott dot every 25 feet,
7 this --

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Probably all of
9 us have been to enough depositions or court hearings and
10 testifying and all that, and maybe Rock more than all of us.

11 You get there and the city starts doing it with a five-
12 foot, had four-inch and six-inch. Then they go to another
13 street. They don't have room. And they put a three-foot
14 buffer, and they put a four-inch and a four-inch, or they
15 put a six-inch and a six-inch.

16 And there is an accident. And somebody's going to
17 say, why did you even put the buffer. Who told you to put
18 the buffer. And if you are putting the buffer, what
19 standard did you use to put the buffer. How do you explain
20 that.

21 There's nothing in any standard that allows you to
22 put a buffer between a bike lane and travel lane. That's
23 what I'm saying, that if you want to do it, and I think it's
24 a good thing to do, but let's do it right. That's what my
25 thinking is as of now.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: There is one more
2 thing. That buffered area could just as well be a landscape
3 area, just like they had in the previous slide where you
4 have the, you know, the bicycle lane --

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Oh, that becomes
6 very different.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: I mean it just --
8 it's very comparable, so, I mean --

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, if you put
10 landscaping--

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: -- then you can't
12 get --

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- then they're
14 separate facilities.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: That's right. I mean
16 if you look at it without parking, but it's a buffer area,
17 it could be a landscaping strip, one without parking. So,
18 you know, to me it's sort of relates back to what you've
19 already seen.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: Then you've got a
21 bicycle path versus a bicycle --

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, then they
23 have the separate --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: -- lane. I think most
25 of your experienced bicyclists would almost prefer a bicycle

1 lane than a bicycle path. Just for accessibility and --

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah. Mr.
3 Fisher.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: This is going
5 to be my final comment on it. I don't think it's just an
6 MUTCD issue. I think it's a vehicle code issue because of
7 that provision we just read about separate roadways
8 delineated by two solid lines more than two feet apart.

9 And as long as we have that language in there, I
10 don't know how we can say that two solid lines more than two
11 feet apart are traversable.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: And I see on then
13 official approval from someone I trust their opinion back
14 there.

15 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes, it's in the vehicle code.
16 It's treated as an island and technically you cannot cross
17 it.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Mr.
19 Babico.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I just want to
21 understand. We have the park lane on the right. A bike
22 lane, and a buffer, and the travel lanes.

23 Now, on the parked cars, on the park lane, can go
24 to the through lane. They have to cross all these lanes,
25 right?

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's the
2 question.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: And we are saying that
4 because they are solid lines they constitute a median?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: An island.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: An island? I'm still
7 not --

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I think --
9 anyways, I don't know if you want to make a motion. Rock,
10 do you know if the city's looking for a motion or you just
11 want to get some ideas and go back --

12 MR. MILLER: I think they're looking for your
13 assistance in answering those questions. I definitely heard
14 that you all see there may be some value in this. I'm not
15 clear on whether you all think that it's in the MUTCD or
16 not.

17 But I would say that one clause, if that clause
18 was modified to indicate that those two stripes either have
19 to be within 12 inches of each other, or accompanied by
20 diagonal lines, it would clearly be something you're not
21 supposed to cross.

22 I definitely think there's an inconsistency
23 between the vehicle code and the way we're currently allowed
24 to stripe bicycle lanes. That's a pretty substantial
25 inconsistency. And either the bike lane guidelines should

1 be changed, or the vehicle code should be changed. And I
2 think a lot of communities would be very interested if that
3 went in a certain way.

4 So I think we've just kind of covered a little tip
5 of an iceberg. I know the city would be more than willing
6 to put together an application for you. We don't see this
7 as a federal issue, as much as we do a state issue.

8 And I think, you know, just with the answer to
9 those questions, I'm hearing different viewpoints on our
10 first question. But I think I'm leaning towards your
11 discussion concluding that it's not currently permitted by
12 the MUTCD.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, I'm glad you
14 said that. So if we want to go that way, let's go to the
15 last question. If the city wishes to proceed the Committee
16 will be happy to receive the application. And since you
17 heard all our comments, maybe you want to include those
18 comments and address them, and see how to go about resolving
19 the -- if there is a discrepancy between the vehicle code
20 and the -- and changing vehicle code is always easier than
21 the manual.

22 MR. MILLER: Really?

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It is, believe
24 me.

25 MR. MILLER: Well, we might need some more help

1 doing that than we would doing the manual. We at least know
2 the procedure for the manual.

3 But I think I understand the direction. I still
4 don't know if the city knows exactly which way they want to
5 go with this. But I'm actually quite positive in hearing
6 most of you thought that it's a good idea. We simply need
7 to find a way to make it an approvable idea.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Any
9 comments you want to share with Mr. Miller? None.

10 Okay, I think you heard enough. And we don't need
11 a motion on this. We'll see if the city decides to pursue.

12 They may think it's not worth the hassle, they may not
13 pursue. But it's a good concept, thank you.

14 Where are we, Mr. Singh?

15 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: One item --

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, we have one
17 item left for request for experimentation. And that is item
18 9-22. It's a request to experiment with a collision
19 countermeasure system for unsignalized intersections by
20 County of San Luis Obispo. You have been sitting and really
21 listening patiently. Thank you.

22 MR. CHAPMAN: So, I'm Ryan Chapman with the County
23 of San Luis Obispo. And we're requesting experimentation to
24 do a collision countermeasure system at the location of
25 Orcutt and Righetti. And I believe on page 55 of the agenda

1 is the detail of what we're looking at.

2 The location is a rural, two rural two-lane roads
3 just south of the City of San Luis Obispo. The alignment
4 along Orcutt Road has a lot of vertical curves which really
5 constrain sight distance.

6 So what we're proposing are some blank-out signs,
7 detection system. That when a vehicle approaches, the limit
8 line it would activate some blank-out signs on Orcutt that
9 would display an entering traffic logo. And some 12-inch
10 flashing amber beacons.

11 And if there are any questions I'd be more than
12 glad to answer them.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Chief?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I've seen this
15 described as a collision countermeasure system, but I'm
16 seeing a crash history of two in four years, one of which
17 was a drunk-driver-caused collision?

18 MR. CHAPMAN: Yes.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: So what exactly crashes
20 are you trying to avoid?

21 MR. CHAPMAN: We don't have a lot of crash history
22 at this location. But we have some other factors that we
23 were looking at and that caused us some concern. The
24 severely constrained alignment, the vertical curvature that
25 causes sight distance constraints was a big part of it.

1 We've also gotten a lot of feedback from the
2 community and the people that live locally. And they have a
3 lot of concern about the location, as well.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I've seen on the
5 engineering traffic survey sight distance is listed as good.

6 MR. CHAPMAN: I'm not quite sure at what location
7 that was taken.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: One mile south, so
9 right at the intersection.

10 MR. CHAPMAN: -- at the intersection. That is not
11 accurate, and the sight distance is constrained. We were
12 collecting some survey data, and the stopping sight distance
13 that we were able to calculate, at least having northbound
14 on Orcutt, was around 40 miles an hour.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: So the ETS is
16 incorrect?

17 MR. CHAPMAN: Yes.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: And I'm also seeing
19 that the way you're going to evaluate this is -- the way
20 you're going to evaluate the counter-crash system is to
21 measure how much of a speed reduction you achieved on the
22 throughway?

23 MR. CHAPMAN: When the system is activated, yes.
24 That came from another similar treatment that was used on
25 the east coast in, I believe, West Virginia. And there's

1 some differences between the two, but they implemented a
2 similar system. Rural county rounds. Theirs were more -- a
3 little straight than ours, but it was still a constrained
4 sight distance.

5 There were also some issues there, but they didn't
6 have a lot of crash history to be statistically certain.
7 So, secondary measure performance was to look at speed
8 reductions when the system was active.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: And I'm seeing that
10 you're proposing a five-year study?

11 MR. CHAPMAN: Yes. I'm trying to get some
12 parallel to the crash history we have for the last five
13 years so that we can hopefully -- and there's no way we're
14 going to be able to demonstrate that we did reduce crashes,
15 but normally we would parallel the study period, five years
16 before crash data and five years after. And that's where
17 that came from.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: I'd just like to make a
19 comment that I think that this is -- I sympathize with the
20 plan. They work for the State of California, we have no
21 money, either. But this appears to me to be a way to try to
22 do something to reduce the speed on the throughway, or
23 improve, because you don't have the money for capital
24 improvement project, to change the roadway alignment or
25 whatever else needs to be done.

1 And a five-year study, you're right, and it's
2 because you have no crash data. You don't have crashes
3 there. Two crashes, one of which was caused by a drunk
4 driver, and you can't even pin that on roadway configuration
5 or anything else. The person was drunk.

6 I don't see this as a valid study.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Henley.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: What kind of volume do
9 you get on Righetti?

10 MR. CHAPMAN: It would be less than 1000 vehicles
11 a day.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: What are those
13 numbers, sir?

14 MR. CHAPMAN: A thousand a day, less than 1000
15 vehicles a day.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So the ADT is
17 about 1000?

18 MR. CHAPMAN: The road goes about a mile and a
19 half till it accesses a lot of avocado orchards, but there's
20 not a lot of commercial and residential traffic.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Believe it or
22 not, I'm familiar with that area for a very strange story.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: A thousand a day, does
24 this letter day 7700 per year?

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yes.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: The main road is 7700 --

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's the main
3 road.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Oh, you were asking
5 about the --

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: The side street.

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Side street.
8 Okay, any other members? Mr. Fisher.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: My concern
10 with the proposal is that it would provide a activated sign
11 for the main route, Orcutt, but no message to the side
12 street. And yet it's the side street, Righetti, which is
13 required to yield, to stop and then enter the intersection
14 when it is safe to do so. There's no message then to the
15 side street traffic as to when there might be a conflict
16 with a through vehicle coming through.

17 So, you're providing a warning to the vehicle that
18 has the right-of-way rather than to the vehicle that needs
19 to stop and yield.

20 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah. Minnesota did a study where
21 they were alerting to the vehicle at the stop -- on the stop
22 approach, that it was safe to proceed. And I've got some
23 concerns with the way that would work with right-of-way law
24 in California.

25 And since we're not signaling the intersection,

1 since we're not giving any active stop control on the side
2 street, or we wouldn't be in this case, giving that kind of
3 message to a stop-controlled intersection, we don't really
4 have a way of controlling Orcutt. It seemed problematic to
5 me.

6 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: And what
7 action is the motorist supposed to take on seeing the
8 activated sign and the yellow flashing signal?

9 MR. CHAPMAN: It's a driver attention intended as
10 issue, and that's kind of why the secondary measure was
11 performance is speed. We're trying to make them aware of
12 the situation so that they're able to respond accordingly
13 because of the constrained sight distance if they need to.

14 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Then what
15 actions have been taken to try to advise the motorist to
16 drive slower because of the sight distance and alignment
17 issues?

18 MR. CHAPMAN: I have an overhead flashing beacon.
19 We have intersection-ahead signs. And we have rumble
20 strips installed on Orcutt leading up to the intersection.

21 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Is there any
22 speed reduction advisory or reduced speed limit in this
23 area?

24 MR. CHAPMAN: I don't have any horizontal curves
25 that we have marked because it's -- on all curves. And the

1 current speed limit isn't posted since it is statutory, it's
2 maximum. So, no.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Any other --

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Just make sure I got it
5 straight. The cross-traffic on the side street. You said
6 that is 1000 vehicles a day?

7 MR. CHAPMAN: Less than 1000 vehicles a day. I
8 don't have a measure on it.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: But on the through
10 street it's only 7700 for the year?

11 MR. CHAPMAN: A day.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: A day, okay. Okay.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: One question I
14 had when I looked at this, and I'm listening to this, and I
15 read before first, why do you think it's a new traffic
16 control device that needs even any approval from the Device
17 Committee? You're not introducing any new sign or any new
18 signal. You're just using them in a new arrangement.

19 MR. CHAPMAN: Well, the blank-out sign would be
20 something that sends the message who's entering traffic.
21 And then the use of the signalization tools --

22 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, no, the use I
23 understand. But the use is a traffic engineering judgment.
24 It's your call. Once any sign and signal is authorized for
25 installation, then how you mix them and how you use them

1 that's your traffic engineering judgment.

2 But even the entering traffic sign I think that's
3 a standard sign, if I'm -- no, entering traffic, we don't
4 allow it?

5 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: Entering traffic.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: We just took a
7 look.

8 MR. BHULLAR: We don't have the entering traffic
9 sign by itself.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Because
11 I'm looking at this, and I'm saying this is the idea whether
12 regardless of what you think about it, I'm saying I don't
13 see any new sign or any new device that needs an
14 authorization.

15 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: We use all the time on
16 the freeway entering traffic. And the traffic entering from
17 the median to the line, the sign is used all the time.

18 MR. BHULLAR: That message is a warning sign
19 that's saying entering -- traffic.

20 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, that's
21 the --

22 MR. BHULLAR: But, this is just entering traffic.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let's go to Mr.
24 Babico first. He has his hand up.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: When I talked to Ryan it

1 seems to me that he explained that this request is a
2 proactive to enhance safety at the intersection. And he
3 said the characteristic of the through lane is undulated for
4 quite of a distance. So you can see that at intermittent
5 times that the terminus cannot see the approaching traffic
6 to that intersection.

7 And he tried, with the flashing beacon first, with
8 the T intersection warning sign. It still is not enhancing
9 the safety. So now he is trying to experiment the black-out
10 with this language on it. Just to be proactive with in mind
11 that the through highway is a problem with the vertical
12 profiles, not vertical profiles at one location, but at
13 continuous undulated.

14 So, at many instances you will see the driver at
15 the terminus cannot see the approaching traffic on the
16 through highway.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. No, I
18 understand the problem. I'm just -- other than maybe the
19 entering traffic that they're looking at, if I were doing
20 this I would just do it. Because I don't see anything is
21 stopping me from using the signals and signs that are
22 already approved in the manual. Once it's approved in the
23 manual, how I arrange them and how I put them together is my
24 engineering judgment.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: You approve any

1 language?

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: No, not any
3 language. I'm saying I don't see anything new and Devinder
4 and Johnny are looking at entering traffic.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yeah.

6 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's the only
7 one.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: That's right.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: But everything
10 else on how you mix them and you put a detector and you put
11 a controller, those are all typical, they're all approved.
12 I don't see any need for experimentation.

13 MR. SPEAKER: But the entering traffic should have
14 that sign --

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: -- but I think CTCDC not
16 to apply for the experiment.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Bhullar, do
18 you have any information that you found you want to share
19 with us, or --

20 MR. BHULLAR: I'm still checking.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So, okay,
22 let me open it to the public. Any members of the public who
23 wish to address the Committee on this item?

24 Seeing none, we did our due diligence. Bring it
25 back to the Committee. So, where do you want to go with

1 this?

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, we are waiting for
3 Johnny Bhullar.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Yeah, the
5 thing I'd like to hear is what latitude is there in the
6 California MUTCD for blank-out signs, or the messages for
7 blank-out signs.

8 MR. BHULLAR: Johnny Bhullar with Caltrans. Yes,
9 I just checked, and like I thought, there is no standard
10 word message on any sign that says entering traffic. So
11 that portion is going to be a new traffic control device.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

13 MR. BHULLAR: And using it in the blank-out,
14 basically right now what we have is we have allowed, first
15 it was three, I believe, the wrong-way turns; the do-not-
16 enter, the wrong-way and the no-left-turn or right-turn
17 symbols. We converted those into blank versions.

18 So any signs, once we mention them in the
19 California MUTCD, based upon CTCDC recommendation, we can
20 convert them into blank-out.

21 So right now I think there are six or seven that
22 we have converted them into blank-out versions. But this
23 sign is not even there in the manual. And, of course, there
24 is no blank-out version, either.

25 So that's the only element in this that I see that

1 requires for us to act and put something in the manual. The
2 flashing beacon portion and, you guys might recall that we
3 did have in the -- there was a recent item in which we had
4 the flashing beacon plaque, and used in a similar situation
5 for stopped traffic ahead situation.

6 In that case what we said is that since the sign
7 is traffic, it's not blank-out, we do not like to do that
8 because that's when your flashing beacon goes out, the
9 meaning becomes the opposite.

10 So, here in this case, since the sign, itself, is
11 also blank-out, and if they go out, they go out, then the
12 meaning at least doesn't become the opposite. I think it
13 would be okay if we went ahead with only the blank-out
14 version, rather than the permanent static. So we shouldn't
15 look at the permanent static version, but only the blank-out
16 version --

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I hear what
18 you're saying. This is the -- because when I see an
19 experimentation request, there are two things I'm looking
20 at. The first thing is what Chief said, is that if you
21 really have a demonstrated problem that the existing devices
22 that are already in the manual have not solved the problem,
23 otherwise why are we introducing something new.

24 On that one, on the first one, I really, as was
25 mentioned before, you have only two accidents and one of

1 them is drunk driving. So, problem are you trying to solve?

2 What else devices have you already put at this location
3 that might not have helped.

4 So you see, I looked at everything that's already
5 approved, rather than requesting introducing a completely
6 new sign into the manual.

7 And then the second one is that I see what is the
8 possibility of other people in the state being able to use
9 it. Because we don't want to approve signs that are going
10 to be only used two or three signs in the whole State of
11 California.

12 So, those are my concerns basically on this
13 request. I still didn't say no, but I said I have those
14 concerns that I don't see a demonstrated problem that has
15 not been able to solve using what we already have. And I
16 don't see a widespread application I need for a new sign or
17 a new device that we are going to experiment with.

18 Mr. Knowles.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Well, first I'd say
20 that the biggest piece of missing information if the sight
21 distance really is limited to 40 miles an hour is the
22 advisory speed sign, so you give the motorist that
23 information.

24 But, I mean, I'm surprised Jacob didn't bring it
25 up. Having worked for a county before, what I'm wondering

1 and always consider in this kind of cases is the worst
2 alternative. You know, if I have a county board of
3 supervisors member that's up for reelection and has made
4 promises, unless I'm extremely proactive I might end up with
5 a three-way stop here. And this is certainly better than a
6 three-way stop, so I want to make sure I do enough to keep
7 political pressure from making me do something worse.

8 I don't know whether you're facing that threat,
9 but I've ended up with four-way stops where I didn't want to
10 have a four-way stop before. And this may head off that
11 threat if you can relieve their presence enough that they
12 get off the back of the county supervisor so that, you
13 know, --

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, but that's
15 exactly what I'm saying. I don't want to solve one
16 intersection's problem by introducing a new sign into the
17 manual that's going to be used in California only once.
18 That's not the purpose of the manual. That was what -- Ms.
19 Wong?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Yeah, I'm wondering if
21 there can be a case for reducing the speed or putting up a
22 sign.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Warning advisory
24 signs?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER WONG: Right, right.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Chief.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Yeah, I don't think
3 there's a demonstrated need. I don't think the
4 characterization of what you're trying to accomplish will be
5 accomplished by this, because there is nothing to reduce.

6 I certainly understand political pressures and all
7 that, but -- and then when it's combined with a traffic
8 survey that completely contradicts what we're saying the
9 problem is, then I have a problem with that, too.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, that's the
11 thing about this speed reduction device.

12 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Yeah.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Henley.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: No, I don't have
15 anything to add.

16 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Fisher.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: There are
18 several things I do like about the proposal, and that is to
19 put in flashing lights when activated, and that would draw
20 attention to the cross-street.

21 But all of that can be done today without coming
22 to this Committee. And I think Hamid brought up a good
23 point that we consider so many novel devices, can't we use
24 the tools in our kit that are already available, and would
25 they address the need.

1 So, before we look at novel new high-tech devices,
2 can we solve the problem with the tools that are already
3 there.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Presleigh.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: I think everything's
6 been said. I'd guess I would look at advisory and
7 undulation advisory signs. Unless you're really seriously
8 forced into an all-the-way stop. Then I would put some
9 additional red lights out there, flashing red lights.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Babico.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No further comment.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. So we have
13 had enough discussion. There was no member of the public.

14 Let's move. Somebody needs to make a motion.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MAYNARD: Make a motion to deny
16 the requested experiment.

17 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There is a motion
18 to deny the request for experimentation with a new device.
19 Is there a second?

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I'll second it.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There is a motion
22 and a second.

23 All those in favor say --

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Can we talk about --

25 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Absolutely. We

1 can have a discussion on the motion. I'm sorry.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Okay.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I'm looking at my
4 watch; I'm trying to wrap this thing up.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: I just want to say, to
6 make it clear, the Committee's not saying don't do something
7 electronic out there. We're not saying don't be innovative.
8 But use some of our existing tools, solar-powered flashing
9 yellow beacons that can be actuated wirelessly. There's a
10 lot of things to do short of doing this particular item. So
11 we're not saying don't do anything here.

12 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Right -- I'm glad
13 Mr. Knowles brought that up, because I'm looking at page 53
14 of 55. Other than that single sign that says entering
15 traffic, there's nothing new in there. You can do all that
16 stuff with the devices that are already approved. The
17 detection activation, that's not even -- if you can find
18 another sign that sends the message that's already in the
19 manual, you can already do all this. There's only one sign
20 -- anyways, so after that discussion there's a motion and a
21 second. Do you want to vote?

22 All those in favor say aye.

23 (Ayes.)

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Anyone opposed?
25 Motion passes unanimously. We thank the City of San Luis

1 Obispo for bringing the application to us and hopefully what
2 we have is going to fix it. County of San Luis Obispo, I
3 should say.

4 Okay, let's go to what we have. Go to --

5 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: There's no item left
6 except this --

7 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Do you want to
8 discuss item --

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Oh, yeah.

10 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Let's see, the
11 discussion item, we have no discussion item.

12 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: No. We have some
13 information on California MUTCD training. What's that
14 about?

15 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Roberta McLaughlin, Office of
16 Signs, Markings; Caltrans.

17 After our meeting in May we proceeded with the Top
18 D, that talked about section 2B-13, changes to that section
19 regarding setting of speed limits. As part of that top D
20 the recommendation was to go out to each of our 12 districts
21 to have training on how we set speed limits; how to follow
22 the manual; what were some of the changes that have been
23 discussed over the lengthy two-year period of time, where a
24 lot of local agencies had concerns.

25 So we have a schedule. We've done one class in

1 Sacramento in August. Our next class is coming up October
2 21st at the district 4 office in Oakland. You can get on
3 the website, the whole schedule is on there.

4 And we're working with CHP as a partner. They're
5 actually there co-teaching the class with myself. And we're
6 inviting local agencies, as well as Caltrans Staff. We have
7 law enforcement personnel involved, and we're inviting the
8 judicial court officials to attend, as well. And they've
9 been very well received. And we'd hope to see some of you
10 folks attending those.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah.

12 So, you want to see where it's coming in your
13 particular area, jump on the website.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: So, just on that
15 one there is a --

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: That's November 5th.

17 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes.

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- there is an
19 organization down in the L.A. Basin area, I don't exactly
20 know who they cover, but several counties. It's the City
21 Traffic Engineers Association. And every year they have a
22 traffic workshop, and probably Rock may know more about
23 this, they have a city traffic workshop that they get about
24 80, 90 city council people and planning commissioners and
25 traffic commissioners.

1 So, if you --

2 MS. McLAUGHLIN: I'm open to attending any of
3 those special meetings.

4 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Yeah, that would
5 be great. And they have like a full-day session. It's a
6 Saturday. I think that will be great if --

7 MS. McLAUGHLIN: I don't know about Saturday.

8 (Laughter.)

9 MS. McLAUGHLIN: No, I've gotten invitations from
10 ITE --

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I thought the
12 state had so much money they'd give you overtime now. No?

13 MS. McLAUGHLIN: No. No, no, no.

14 (Parties speaking simultaneously.)

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Anyways, I'll
16 give you the information; it may be something good if you
17 guys can at least give them your material.

18 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yes. Please send them my way.
19 We are doing these other -- especially in a particular part
20 of the state for training, I will attend special meetings.
21 ITE meetings have invited me to just do a little snippet of
22 what we're talking about. So I'd be happy to do that.

23 There is a schedule that was on the table over
24 there, so that has some of the other dates and locations on
25 it, as well.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: That's an
2 excellent effort, thank you. Mr. Fisher.

3 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I just wanted
4 to ask, in addition to having these workshops, what effort
5 has been underway to teach the different Caltrans personnel
6 about the new speed zone requirements.

7 MS. McLAUGHLIN: They're a big part of these
8 workshops. They are in attendance at the workshops, as
9 well.

10 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Right, but do
11 they know anything about this before you conduct the
12 workshop?

13 MS. McLAUGHLIN: As in?

14 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Well, the
15 reason why I ask is we share a street that's also a state
16 highway. Just right after the directive came out, we got
17 the speed zone survey and they authorized a speed limit that
18 was nine miles an hour below the 85th percentile speed.

19 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Imagine that.

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: And we said,
21 don't you know anything about the rules. And they were not
22 aware of it at all.

23 MS. McLAUGHLIN: No. The Top D was issued July
24 1st, as you all well know. And this part of this training
25 is to get the word out. Each of these traffic engineers in

1 the districts have been working with me to set up, so they
2 are very familiar with what the changes have been, because
3 we re-emphasize the Top D, as well as the changes that went
4 into the manual.

5 So their presence at these workshops -- and we
6 have found that there is a lot of inconsistency, even within
7 Caltrans, on how we do engineering traffic surveys, so.
8 This is why we're going out and we're doing the training.
9 We'll have all these done by Christmastime.

10 And then in addition to that, we're also probably
11 going to have, after the first of the year, a workshop with
12 Caltrans traffic engineers that are working on the speed
13 limits.

14 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Another --

15 MS. McLAUGHLIN: To make further -- excuse me.
16 Because one of the questions that have come up on section
17 2B-13, we only made minor changes based on the Top D, and
18 getting the gist of what the Committee had approved.

19 There's a lot of other language in there that
20 needs cleaning up. And so through those workshops we're
21 getting input, and determining, you know, where the
22 specifics that go into the engineering traffic survey.

23 Right now there's a distinction between state
24 versus local agencies, and we're trying to clean that up so
25 it's the same for everybody.

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There are a
2 couple of ideas, if they want to look into it. One is if
3 you have a piece for western, the ITE, the western district.

4 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Oh, very good, um-hum.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: If you put a one
6 page in for them, it's good, you know, it gets the message
7 out.

8 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Okay.

9 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Also there is a
10 UC Berkeley fundamental of traffic engineering. And Rock
11 Miller is one of the instructors there. If they get your
12 information, so as they're teaching people the fundamentals,
13 they've --

14 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Right.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: -- got some. So
16 the more we get the word out, the better.

17 MS. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah. My name's on the agenda,
18 so -- and Rock and I -- in fact, Rock is doing an MUTCD
19 class up in the north state area. And so we had to kind of
20 juggle our schedule because a lot of people will be
21 attending the MUTCD class, and then coming to the speed
22 workshop the next day.

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay.

24 MS. McLAUGHLIN: So, my name is on the agenda and
25 you know how to get ahold of any of us. So, let us know.

1 We'll make arrangements. Thank you.

2 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Thank you very
3 much. So that was it for the informational MUTCD training.

4 Information items, we have already covered. We're
5 moving to tabled items. Do we need to discuss any of those
6 at this time?

7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: No.

8 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: There is no new
9 development on any of those three?

10 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: No.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Before I
12 go to next meeting, I think there was a request for an off-
13 agenda item?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Yes.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Mr. Babico.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Right. We do have a
17 proposal to have the signs for the wildfire that a couple
18 years ago I was in negotiation or discussion with Caltrans.
19 And Caltrans approved to install such a sign saying,
20 entering wildfire area.

21 One of the state route is 138, and the other one
22 is state route 2. We installed these warning signs.

23 These warning signs will enhance the motorist
24 behavior when they enter the wildfire zones, at least to
25 watch for their engines, not to be overheated. If the

1 driver or passenger are smokers, to not throw away the
2 cigarette butts in the area, because it's very vulnerable
3 for the fire.

4 As well as there are some signs posted on the
5 freeways where it says, entering hazardous fire area or
6 leaving hazardous fire area.

7 Since we are in the version of updating the
8 California MUTCD, why can't we add these to the MUTCD?
9 Since we are, southern California, very vulnerable for these
10 wildfires. It would enhance the public motorist when they
11 enter these areas.

12 So, I'll pass it on, these other signs. The first
13 one was approved by Caltrans for us to install it under
14 encroachment permit, and we installed them on state highway
15 138 and 2. And the other was installed on the freeways.

16 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: You mean you
17 didn't go through the Committee to experiment?

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: No, it was very
19 emergency case. And the fire departments approved it. And
20 then to Jerry Meese, he approved it under RADAR, and we went
21 and installed it.

22 MR. BHULLAR: -- did under RADAR --

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Don't blame it on
24 Jerry now that he's gone, you know, it's Jerry's fault.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Well, I have the email

1 attached to it.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: Is it just restricted
3 to southern California, or could it be --

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: No, --

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Could be anyplace.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESLEIGH: All right.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: But this is what
8 happened, from my experience, we installed them on state
9 routes within the County of San Bernardino.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Just on state routes.

11 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Bring it to
12 the next meeting; make it an action item.

13 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Since it's been
14 there for awhile, let's make it an action item for next
15 meeting. They don't see an urgency anyways, and so they're
16 out there --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: They are in place. And
18 I wonder if Caltrans can help me to identify those now on
19 the freeways for entering and leaving the hazardous fire
20 area. Those signs.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: I don't think we have an
22 inventory on those signs. We'd have to go visit our federal
23 law or something.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, so we'll
25 bring it back as an action item for our next meeting. Okay.

1 Last item --

2 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: Or discussion.

3 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Action.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Action.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Because it's
6 already approved. They say -- approved this; it's already
7 out there in the field. Except if you want to discuss it
8 and come up with a new design or something.

9 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Are we sure
10 we're ready just to give approval for something --

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: No, we're not. We're
12 just going to make it an action item and then, you know,
13 we'll have whatever policy goes with it, and it'll just show
14 up as an action item at the next meeting. That okay?

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: I hear what John
16 is saying. Do you want to bring it as a discussion item
17 first?

18 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: This is the
19 first I'm seeing of the sign.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Also the fire
21 departments, southern California, they support these signs,
22 and the need of it.

23 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I don't know
24 what it means, if it means you're entering a fire area, or a
25 potential fire --

1 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: The issue is that
2 if you bring it as an action item, and you're not ready, we
3 can always table and give comments so they bring back. If
4 you bring it as a discussion item, and then you want to read
5 approval, there's no need to do that. Then you have to
6 bring it back again as an action item.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I'm open either way.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER HENLEY: As a matter of timing it
9 would be nice to get it in, you know, if they're going to be
10 anywhere else for the next fire season, which would be
11 probably next spring.

12 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Do you have
13 language that would say where they're to be installed, what
14 constitutes a fire zone area, blah, blah, blah?

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: The fire department
16 decided where we install those.

17 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: No, but --

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER KNOWLES: No, we don't have any
19 language.

20 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: I'm just
21 saying, if you're going to bring it to the Committee as an
22 action item, you need to have figured all this out.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Right.

24 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: It's up to you.
25 We can bring it as a discussion item. You're going to miss

1 this fire cycle anyway, because it's going to be in January
2 when we meet next time, so.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: What I suggest is that
4 we work together, Caltrans and the County of San Bernardino,
5 since in both jurisdictions we have the signs.

6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY SINGH: We will let you do
7 that, Jacob, so you propose the language and I'll put it on
8 the agenda.

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: I don't mind. But I
10 need some background for where the freeway signs.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay, so what's
12 your pleasure? Do you want to bring it back discussion or
13 action item?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Either way.

15 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Discuss it
16 later; see what you've --

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: It's up to them --

18 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: Okay. Next
19 meeting. Do you have your calendars? We're looking at
20 somewhere in January, anywhere from January --

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Shouldn't it be before
22 January 22nd?

23 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: What's happening
24 January 22nd?

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Because he has some

1 deadlines for the MUTCD, California MUTCD or something.

2 MR. BHULLAR: You guys gave me the blessings
3 today, so as far as I'm concerned, pretty much I can clean
4 it up, I'm going to post it online.

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: But probably
6 we'll meet before January 21st, before January 22nd. So how
7 is January 21st? That's a Thursday. Is that going to work
8 for the members?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: We have one day holiday
10 in January.

11 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: All right, so
12 they have a one only holiday, that's Martin Luther King Day;
13 it's on a Monday. 21st?

14 Okay, anybody that has a problem with 21st say
15 your piece now. Okay, seeing none, so it's January 21st,
16 Thursday is going to be our next meeting.

17 As far as location, we need to go south; we've
18 been north a few meetings. Either San Diego or southern
19 California basin. What's your pleasure?

20 SPEAKERS: San Diego.

21 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: San Diego. You
22 guys like San Diego. San Diego? Okay.

23 Mr. Singh is going to work; we probably are going
24 to meet at the Caltrans Headquarter. They have a pretty
25 nice facility there. I've had a couple meetings there in

1 their conference room.

2 Okay, gentlemen, January 21st. Thank you very
3 much. We are adjourned.

4 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: No motion?

5 COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON BAHADORI: We need a motion?

6 A motion for adjournment.

7 COMMITTEE VICE CHAIRPERSON FISHER: Motion.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER BABICO: Second.

9 (Whereupon, at 3:30 p.m., the meeting of the California
10 Traffic Control Devices Committee was adjourned.)

11 --o0o--

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, RICHARD FRIANT, an electronic reporter, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that I recorded the foregoing California Traffic Control Devices Committee meeting; that thereafter the tape recording was transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting, or in any way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 12th day of October, 2009.

Richard Friant
Official Reporter